

NY 22 '07

THE MONTH

A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 515 (NEW SERIES 125) MAY, 1907

CONTENTS

MR. R. J. CAMPBELL AND THE NEW THEOLOGY.

By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith 449

LAUNDRY WORK AND LEGISLATION.....*By Lucy Wyatt Papworth* 468

FERDINAND BRUNETIÈRE.....*By Marcus K. Ambrose* 480

GALILEO.....*By the Editor* 489

A ROYAL RECLUSE. I.....*By the Countess de Courson* 504

ST. BERNARDINE OF SIENA IN ART.....*By Virginia M. Crawford* 516

FURTHER LIGHT ON OATES'S PLOT.....*By Alfred Marks* 524

LOIS. Chapters XLVI.—XLVIII.....*By Emily Hickey* 529

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.....*By the Montagnini Papers.* 540

The Pronunciation of Latin.

REVIEWS.....*By the Editor* 550

SHORT NOTICES.....*By the Editor* 558

MAGAZINES.....*By the Editor* 560

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO
LONDON · ONE SHILLING

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

PSYCHOLOGY:

Empirical and Rational.

BY

MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.LIT.; M.A. LOND.

SIXTH EDITION.

(FOURTEENTH TO SEVENTEENTH THOUSAND.)

PRICE 6s. 6d.

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Second Edition, Rewritten and Enlarged. (Fourth to Sixth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, and Bombay.





Mr. R. J. Campbell and the New Theology.

It is vain to propose an Eirenicon by the corruption of a word.
(JAMES MARTINEAU.)

MR. R. J. CAMPBELL is justified in disclaiming the honours of an inventor either for the name or the ideas known as the New Theology. The name appears to have come over in the first instance from America, but the ideas labelled by it are ideas which have been forming during recent decades on both sides of the Atlantic in the minds of religious thinkers rationalistically inclined. Still, the public has not gone far astray in closely connecting Mr. Campbell's name with the resultant movement. He himself, not without reason, claims that his book¹ is "the first systematic statement of the New Theology which has yet been made," and it may be added that all is set forth in it in a sufficiently clear and striking as well as popular style to recommend it to the general class of slightly educated readers. Thus, through it, and through the weekly addresses its author is able to deliver from so well-established a popular pulpit, the claims of the New Theology are likely to be vastly more widely known, discussed, and embraced than they have hitherto been. He may not unreasonably then be regarded as its apostle.

That, however, as he would be the first to say, is a comparatively small matter. The important matter is the nature of the New Theology as advocated by Mr. Campbell, the value of the reasons offered on its behalf, and the influence, religious or otherwise, it is likely to exercise, particularly on the future of the Nonconformist denominations. And in all these respects it is as revolutionary as could well be.

Of course it is ushered in with the plea that Christianity has lost its hold on the modern world, and that this is chiefly

¹ *The New Theology.* By the Rev. R. J. Campbell, M.A. London : Chapman and Hall.

because "Christian truth has become associated in the popular mind with forms of statement which thoughtful men find it impossible to accept not only on theological, but even on moral grounds." Still the prospect, we are told, is not hopeless, only Christian truth needs re-stating "in terms of the modern mind," and it is suggested that thus re-stated it will merely be delivered from the misconceptions and misinterpretations of the intervening ages, and brought back more nearly to the form in which it was originally presented to the world.

What is wanted is freshness and simplicity of statement. The New Theology is only new in the sense that it seeks to substitute simplicity for complexity and to get down to moral values in its use of religious terms. Our objection is not so much to the venerable Creeds of Christendom as to the ordinary interpretation of those Creeds; and, creeds or no creeds, we hold that the religious experience which came to mankind in Jesus of Nazareth is enough for all our needs, and only requires to be freed from limiting statements in order to lay firm hold once more upon the civilized world.¹

The starting point of this needful re-statement of Christian truth is a "re-emphasis of the Christian belief in the Divine Immanence in the universe and in mankind."² The older theology—or, as Mr. Campbell would prefer to say, the theology of the "immediate past"—is said to conceive of God as distinct from the world and standing apart from it, though knowing all that goes on in it and reserving to Himself the right to interfere in it sometimes. The New Theology holds that He does indeed transcend our universe in the sense that the capabilities of His being are not exhausted by the expression of Himself which is therein given; but that He is at the same time immanent in it, and so far identical with it, inasmuch as its nature is to be just one aspect under which He attains His desire for self-realization.

Why is there a universe at all? Why has the unlimited become limited? What was the need for the long cosmic struggle, the ignorance and pain, the apparently prodigal waste of life and beauty? Why does a perfect form appear only to be shattered and superseded by another? What can it all mean, if it has a meaning? . . . It is that this finite universe of ours is one means to the self-realization of the infinite. Supposing God to be infinite consciousness, there are still possibilities to that consciousness, which it can only know as it becomes limited. . . . You may know yourself to be a brave man, but

¹ P. 3.

² P. 4.

you will know it in a higher way if you are a soldier facing the cannon's mouth ; you will know it in a still different way if you have to face the hostility and prejudice of a whole community for standing by something which you believe to be right. . . . Do not these facts of human nature and experience tell us something about God ? To all eternity God is what He is, and never can be other ; but it will take Him to all eternity to live out all that He is. In order to manifest even to Himself the possibilities of His being, God must limit that being. There is no other way in which the fullest self-realization can be attained. Thus we get two modes of God—the infinite, perfect, unconditioned, primordial being ; and the finite, imperfect, conditioned, and limited being of which we are ourselves the expression. And yet these two are one, and the former is the guarantee that the latter shall not fail in the purpose for which it became limited.¹

If this is God we next ask, "Who and what are we ?" and Mr. Campbell undertakes to answer us. His answer is not easy to understand, being based on the doctrine of philosophical idealism—that "nothing exists except in and for mind," so that "the true being is consciousness, and the universe, visible and invisible, is consciousness." But reasoning on these lines he raises the question, What is the amplitude of personality, that human personality which he identifies with human consciousness ? The point is that modern psychology has sought to distinguish between a surface and a subliminal consciousness, between our ordinary mental action each stage of which we are mentally aware of and are mentally conducting, and that "unconscious cerebration" which goes on beneath the surface of our mental life, and makes itself known to us only through the finished mental products with which eventually it presents us. If our personality is our consciousness, are we to restrict it to the surface self only, or must we not rather recognize that beneath this surface self there is a deeper self, to which the surface self bears a relation like that of some island in the Pacific to the vast submerged mountain of which it is the tiny summit ; and is not the conclusion irresistible that "of our truer deeper being we are quite unconscious" ? Further inferences, moreover, are drawn, which this similitude of the submerged mountain and its dry summit helps us to understand. One is that the whole human race is fundamentally one. "All life, indeed, is fundamentally one," but "the kinship of man with man precedes his kinship with any other order of being ;" and though "common

¹ P. 22.

sense (may) assume that I and Thou are eternally distinct," we are daily finding reason for thinking otherwise. "Ultimately your being and mine are one, and we shall come to know it. Individuality only has meaning in relation to the whole, and individual consciousness can only be fulfilled by expanding until it embraces the whole. . . . I shall not cease to be I nor you to be you; but there must be a region of experience where we shall find that you and I are one."¹

A still further inference is that "the highest of all selves, the ultimate Self of the Universe, is God."

The New Testament speaks of man as body, soul, and spirit. The body is the thought-form through which the individuality finds expression on our present limited plane, the soul is a man's consciousness of himself as apart from all the rest of existence and even from God . . . it is the bay seeing itself as the bay, and not as the ocean; the spirit is the true being thus limited and expressed—it is the deathless Divine within us. The Soul, therefore, is what we make it; the spirit we can neither make nor mar, for it is at once our being and God's. What we are here to do is . . . to build up that self-realization which is God's objective with the universe as a whole, and with every self-conscious unit in particular.²

It occurs to us at once, on hearing this assertion of a continuity of selfhood between man and God, to ask is there then no dividing line between our being and God's, and the answer is that there is none, except from our side. "The ocean of consciousness knows that the bay has never been separate from itself, although the bay is only conscious of the ocean on the outer side of its own being." It occurs to us again that this theory is simple Pantheism. But Mr. Campbell denies it, on the ground that Pantheism stands for "a God imprisoned in His Universe, a God who cannot help Himself, who does not even know what He is about," who is a mere blind force; whilst this immanent God is "my deeper Self and yours too, is the Self of the Universe and knows all about it"³—a ground which some will deem insufficient, the essence and vice of Pantheism lying in this that by making out man to be a part of God it robs God of His infinity and man of his personality. It occurs to us once more that the theory strikes at the root of human freedom and hence of human responsibility—to which again we get the insufficient answer that human freedom is limited,

¹ P. 30.

² P. 34.

³ P. 35.

like that of a bird in a cage, a fact which no one denies, whereas our difficulty is that the theory leaves us no basis for freedom of any kind whatever.

However, for the moment we wish to state not to criticize Mr. Campbell's theory, and we must see next what, under the exigencies of this conception of divine and human being, are the conceptions he is led to hold regarding some other important points of doctrine. And first of Sin. Of course he rejects the doctrine of an original Fall, and, as apparently he knows of no other version of that catastrophe save the one first given by Luther, we need not be so surprised that he rejects it. The sin that we should call actual sin he defines to be selfishness. It is the opposite of love, and "if the true life (or love) is the life which is lived in terms of the whole, then the sinful life is the life which is lived for self alone."¹ The necessity for sin arises out of the very nature of God, for creation being the self-expression of God, and God being love, and love being incapable of realizing itself except through sacrifice, there must be pain in the world to furnish the occasion of sacrifice, and if there is pain there is also the opportunity for the selfishness opposed to sacrifice. At the same time we are not to suppose that sin has inflicted any injury on God so as to incur His wrath. "It is the God within who is injured by it, rather than the God without,"² nor are we to suppose that it can be taken away by any divine Atonement or divine forgiveness. For sin is selfishness and the only way to get rid of selfishness is by the ministry of love.

Mr. Campbell is profuse in his recognition of the supreme importance for faith and morals of the personality of Jesus. "Christianity," he says,—truly if inelegantly,—"draws its sustenance from the belief that Jesus is still alive and impacting Himself upon the world and His followers;" and in this it differs from every other religion on earth, none of which claims for its founder more than that he lived at some date or other in the past, and then died, leaving behind only the legacy of his teaching and example. "Christianity, without Jesus, is the world without the sun." What then does the New Theology permit us to hold concerning Him? How in adherence to its principles, and to the re-statements which these require, is it to

¹ P. 52. ² P. 165.

fulfil its promise of taking from us nothing which belongs to the essence and original purity of our Christian belief in Jesus Christ?

He begins his answer to this demand by assuring us, somewhat to our surprise, that he "believes what the Christian Creeds say about the person of Jesus," and even thinks the Athanasian Creed "a magnificent piece of work, if only the Churches would consent to understand it in terms of the oldest theology of all." Still, literally understood, he rejects those articles of belief as altogether incredible, and he exhorts us to shed the husk and be content in future with the kernel. Is then Jesus God? No, he says, not if by that appellation we mean that He "possessed the all-controlling consciousness of the universe"—for "He prayed to His Father sometimes with agony and dread; He endured, suffered, wept, and grew weary; He confessed His ignorance of some things, and declared Himself to have no concern with others (and it is) even doubtful how far He was prepared to receive the homage of those about Him;" and that means that His consciousness was "a true human consciousness limited like our own, and, like our own, subject to the ordinary ills of life."¹ We might be disposed to suggest that this only proves that He had, through His Incarnation, a perfect human nature, which orthodox Christians themselves maintain, but that the question of His divinity is the question of the divine nature which they hold Him to have had also, and from all eternity. But this suggestion Mr. Campbell does not think worth refuting. He thinks it enough to drive it off with that convenient whip "the trend of modern thought," which, he says, is refuting it effectually. He will not even allow that this dogma of the two natures has ever been really believed, at least "in its practical implications"—"although at one time there was a danger that the winsome figure of Jesus would be removed altogether from the field of human interest and regard," having given place to the terrifying figure of the Jesus of Michael Angelo's Last Judgment in the conventional Christianity of the time.

What next! one is prone to exclaim on encountering this estimate of the history of Christian belief. But we must reflect that Mr. Campbell's experience has been of the tone and spirit of a certain type of English Protestantism, and we may call to mind the judgment, too sweeping perhaps but still based on

¹ P. 78.

a substantial truth, of the ex-Father Suffield, as quoted in the thoughtful pages of a recent writer:¹

I say this from my own experience, the Roman Church is the only Christian Church believing in the Incarnation which does at all realize the meaning of it. . . . It often seems to me, when I hear men fighting for the Nicene Creed and the Divinity of Christ, how far they are from knowing what they mean. I have trembled, literally trembled, as I contemplated with faith that doctrine of the Divinity of Christ . . . [but] the Church of Rome recognizes the Incarnation as the foundation of the supernatural, and carries it into the whole life of man. It becomes to the profound Roman Catholic something more real than the natural.

If, however, Jesus is not God in the sense of orthodox believers, in what sense is He God, and even "very God," as Mr. Campbell does not shrink from calling Him? Well, we must fall back on the doctrine we have heard him expound concerning the nature of God and His relation to Man. We have to consider, he has told us, two modes in the being of God, the infinite, perfect, unconditioned, primordial being, and the finite, imperfect, conditioned, and limited being, "of which we ourselves are the expression."² As we are the expression of the latter, and hence of the former too—since "these two are one"—so also is Jesus Christ; only that He is a far more perfect expression than are we, and so is more truly God than we are. For "by Divinity we mean the essence of the nature of the immanent God, the innermost and all-determining quality of that nature," and this "innermost determining quality of the divine nature is perfect love." Hence, whilst "everything that exists is divine because the whole universe is an expression of the being of God," Jesus was in a very special and even unique sense divine because His life (and His only) was a consistent expression of Divine love. This we understand to be Mr. Campbell's doctrine, after a careful study of his words, but lest it should seem to the reader to be too unreal for any one to hold, here is his own summary statement of it.

Briefly summed up, the position is as follows: Jesus was God, but so are we. He was God because His life was the expression of Divine love; we, too, are one with God in so far as our lives express the same thing. Jesus was not God in the sense that He possessed an infinite consciousness; no more are we. Jesus expressed fully and completely,

¹ *The Modern Pilgrim's Progress*, p. 57.

² P. 74.

in so far as finite consciousness ever could, that aspect of the nature of God which we have called the eternal Son, or Christ, or ideal Man, who is the Soul of the Universe, and "the light that lightest every man that cometh into the world;" we are expressions of the same primordial being. Fundamentally we are all one in this Eternal Christ.¹

The mention of the Eternal Christ, in the last sentence of this passage, refers to Mr. Campbell's doctrine of the Trinity, to which we must next come. One would hardly have expected him to have a doctrine of the Trinity had he not assured us of his entire acceptance of the language of the Creeds. But of course it is very dissimilar from the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

When [he says] we start thinking about existence as a whole, and ourselves in particular, we are compelled to assume the infinite, the finite, and the activity of the former within the latter. In other words, we have to postulate God, the universe, and God's operation within the universe. Look at these three conceptions for a moment, and it will be seen that every one of them implies the rest: they are a Trinity in Unity. The primordial being must be infinite . . . to our experience the universe is finite . . . and (since) the infinite must be that outside of which nothing exists or can exist, . . . we are compelled to think of the infinite as ever active within the finite.²

Moreover—

Thinkers have always been compelled to construe the universe in terms of the highest known to man, namely, his own moral nature. It was natural, therefore, that while they thought of the universe as an expression of God, they should think of it as the expression of that side of His being which can only be described as the ideal or archetypal manhood. . . . (And) if we think of the archetypal eternal Divine Man, the source and sustenance of the universe, and yet transcending the universe, we cannot do better than think of Him in terms of Jesus: Jesus is the fullest expression of that Eternal Divine Man on the field of human history. Here then we have the first and second factors in the doctrine of the Trinity morally and spiritually construed.³

If it is asked where, similarly construed, is the third factor, we do not find that Mr. Campbell anywhere explains distinctly, nor are we at all clear how he would explain it. Perhaps, however, we may gather what the explanation would be by bringing together two passages, in one of which he contends that Incarnation and the Christhood it conveys are not confined to Jesus though perfect only in Him, but appertain to us also,

¹ P. 94.

² P. 86.

³ P. 89.

and in the other of which he asserts the relation of the Holy Spirit to this Incarnation in us. Thus we find him saying :

As we have come forth from this fontal manhood, we too must to some extent be expressions of this eternal Christ ; and it is in virtue of that fact that we stand related to Jesus, and that the personality of Jesus has anything to do with us. Here is where the value of our belief in the interaction of the higher and lower self comes in. Fundamentally our being is already one with that of the eternal Christ, and faith in Jesus is faith in Him. . . . He lived His life in such way as to reveal the very essence of the Christ nature. He is therefore central for us and we are complete in Him.¹

And again, though in another chapter and in another connection :

There is a great truth contained in the idea of a virgin-birth [which idea, it is hardly necessary to say, Mr. Campbell refuses to take literally]. It is the truth that the emergence of anything great or beautiful in human character is the work of the Divine Spirit operating within human limitations. . . . Wherever the Christ-man appears, we have to acknowledge that the principal factor in his evolution is the incoming of the Divine Spirit. It is only another way of stating what was stated above, that the true man or higher self is Divine and eternal, integral to the being of God, and that this Divine manhood is gradually but surely manifesting on the physical plane.²

Here the "Divine Spirit" would appear to be the action, or operation, by which the higher self, which is God in the first and infinite mode of His existence, works on the lower self, which is God in the second and finite mode of His existence, and gradually elevates it. We must presume, therefore, that the author assigns to this "Divine Spirit" the same being and operation in regard to that very high indeed, but still lower self which was Jesus Christ.

"The Christian doctrine of the Atonement," Mr. Campbell fully realizes, "bulks so largely in Christian thought that all others may be held to be dependent upon it, even that of the person of Jesus." He gives a statement of it, which indeed is according to the Lutheran conception, and brings against it the usual objection that it convicts God of incompetence in so creating the race as to involve it in inherited sin, and of cruelty in requiring such a reparation.³ But what concerns us now is

¹ P. 91.

² Pp. 105, 107.

³ We must do him the justice to mention that he allows that "the Roman Catholic doctrine of Atonement is a much better statement of the truth than conventional Protestant statements about the 'finished work,' and so on." (P. 145.)

his own doctrine of Atonement, and it is this: "Atonement is the assertion of the fundamental oneness of man with man and all with God. Sin is the divisive separating thing in our relations with one another, and with God the source of all, so the assertion of our oneness involves getting rid of sin."¹ And sin (for Mr. Campbell) being selfishness, the only way to get rid of it is by the ministry of love, which attains its highest elevation in self-sacrifice. There, then, is the Atonement of Jesus Christ. "On the field of human history the death of Jesus is the focus and concentrated essence of this age-long atoning process, whereby selfishness is being overcome and the whole race lifted to its home in God."² But this Atonement, again, is not confined to Christ. He was the leader, and in that sense His atonement was unique, but it was the same in kind as that made by the long series of devoted men, headed by the Apostles, who have sacrificed themselves for the sake of others, in the spirit of love.

If you want to see the Atonement at work, go wherever love is ministering to human necessity, and you see the very same spirit which was in Jesus—the spirit which heals and saves. Dogma is doing nothing to save the world; the gospel of self-sacrifice is doing everything. Show me a Christ-like life, and I will show you a part of the Atonement of Christ.³

These are the fundamental points of the New Theology, as expounded by Mr. Campbell. Some other points we must indicate more summarily. He has a chapter on Salvation, Judgment, and the Life to come; and one turns to it with curiosity, to see how his views on God, Christ, and Sin will require him to re-shape these time-honoured doctrines. "It would help to clear the subject," he says, with commendable candour, "if I were to say frankly before going any further that there is no such thing as punishment, no far-off Judgment Day, no great white throne, and no Judge external to ourselves."⁴ Salvation there will be, but it will consist in the extirpation of all selfishness from the heart of the saved person, and the substitution of a perfect love for others and for the whole. This substitution, moreover, will be established sooner or later in the hearts of all, for it is inconceivable that, at this side of the grave or the next, that higher self which lies beneath our lower self, and is in so peculiar a sense an integral part of God, should

¹ P. 165.

² P. 166.

³ P. 168.

⁴ P. 213.

not eventually prevail over the lower, to which lower, it will be remembered, it limited itself for a time only, that it might pass through the stages of a process of self-realization.¹ This process of extirpation and substitution being of the nature of self-sacrifice, is essentially through pain, and this pain is all the punishment of sin that there is or can be; and the judge who allots it to us is that "deeper self who is eternally one with God." And what of death and immortality? Strange to say, Mr. Campbell holds by the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ, or—perhaps we should rather say—is inclined to hold by it. But he does not attach much importance to the point as indicative of the mode of our own after-life. The sacred writers, when they speak of our resurrection, are thinking, he is sure, of a spiritual resurrection only, and that resolves itself into just that triumph of perfect love in the hearts of all others which Jesus Christ realized in His own heart from the first, and set before us for our example and encouragement. Nor does he think the after-death life will differ essentially from that we lead here, except that it will mark a further stage towards the attainment of the inevitable triumph. "My own impression," he says, "is that when we individually pass through this crisis we shall find the change to be very slight. It will mean the dropping of the scales from the eyes, and that is about all. The things that we have been living on this side will only profit us so far as they have gone to the building up of a Christ-like character."²

Our readers can gather sufficiently from the foregoing what are the leading features of Mr. Campbell's version of the New Theology. We have now to indicate a few points, the consideration of which will aid them in forming a judgment on its character and value. To begin with the doctrine of divine immanence. This is a term much used now-a-days, but those who use it are too often obscure in defining what they mean by it. If the doctrine is a protest against the Deist doctrine that God's abiding relation to the world is that of an earthly mechanic, as, for instance, a watchmaker, who, his work finished, henceforth stands apart from it, taking no part in its action save occasionally when called in to repair its defects—then it is enough that this immanence should include divine conservation as the continuance of divine creation, divine concurrence in each operation of the creature, together with the

¹ P. 216.

² P. 229.

omnipresence and providence involved in such conservation and concurrence. But that is just what the Catholic Church has always held and taught. If, on the contrary, by divine immanence is meant—as it undoubtedly is by Mr. Campbell—that the union between God and man, between God and the universe is such that, for that department and aspect of the Divine Being, God *is* man, and *is* the universe, then we are landed in a Pantheism irreconcilable with the Divine infinity. For if the infinite needed to limit itself successively that it might attain to mode after mode of self-realization, then it lacked at a prior stage of its existence a series of perfections which it only gradually acquired ; in other words, it was not originally infinite, which is only another way of saying that it is not infinite at all, but finite. And again, man and the universe are confessedly finite, as also must be all others of those self-limiting expressions of the Divine nature which according to this author are continuing, side by side or successively, throughout eternity. Thus we have an infinite composed of a sum total of finites, whereas a sum total is essentially numerical, and to be in number, however high the number may be, is essentially to be in this number or that—and so to be finite. Again, as has been said, immanence, if we have to take it in a Pantheistic sense, robs man of his personality. Mr. Campbell assumes that modern psychology has transformed our concept of personality, and with the aid of the new concept he has conceived the idea of a continuity between human and divine personality after the manner of the continuity between the bay and the ocean. But any philosophical concept of personality to be valid, must be a sound interpretation of this same concept as formed and accepted in our ordinary common-sense thinking and conversing ; whereas the one on which Mr. Campbell relies does not appear to conform with this test. By the person or "I," we mean ordinarily, not the exercise itself of consciousness, but the entirety of the being endowed with consciousness, the existence and character of whom an exercise of consciousness perceives. Thus in a man body as well as soul, sensation as well as intelligence and consciousness, arms, legs, as well as heart and brain, combine to make up the personality which he detects and asserts when by an exercise of self-consciousness he says "I" or "myself." And the same must be said of the subconscious mind ; it and the conscious mind are both parts of the same "I" or "myself." Moreover, besides the positive side, there is the negative side of the

concept, as we have it in ordinary usage, for when a man says "I" or "myself," he means to assert not only his possession of all the constituents of his own personality, but the absolute and irreducible distinctness of his personality from every other personality. Hence the concept of "a person of a person" is not thinkable, and not less unthinkable is that of a higher and lower self in continuity one with the other. We do indeed in a loose or derived sense use and contrast these terms, understanding by them the same person according as he elects to follow the higher or the lower impulses of his nature, just as we distinguish and contrast the same man's official and private personality, understanding by them the same person according as he acts in his official or his private capacity. But, if we are using the term "person" strictly, we are designating something which is one and indivisible, incapable therefore of grades of higher and lower selfhoods. Either then a man has no personality of his own but is a part of God's, which is Pantheism, or there can be no continuity but only the opposition of distinctness between His Personality and the man's. And Mr. Campbell's similitude drawn from the bay and the ocean, unless he wishes to argue from a comparison, must be expounded in conformity with these principles. If we can conceive bay and ocean to be endowed with consciousness, the bay's consciousness would either be attesting falsely, or it would attest that the bay had no personality of its own, but was an element in the personality of the ocean.

One further remark before we leave this question of immanence which has carried Mr. Campbell into the abyss of Pantheism. It is evident that he has been led to it by a false conception of the implications of infinity. There cannot "be an infinite and a finite beyond it," he says, and, again, "the infinite must be that outside of which nothing exists nor can exist." No, that statement is excessive. We are only entitled to say that there can be nothing outside the infinite and distinct from it save such as owes its existence, and the continuance of its existence, to the infinite, and is dependent on it in every respect. We are only entitled to say this because all that the idea of the infinite implies is that there can be nothing besides itself which involves setting a limit to its being; whereas to have dependent on itself a being external to itself which it has created, and to which it has imparted a mode of reality the equivalent of which it possesses itself in a vastly

transcendent manner—that, surely, is not setting a limit to its own being.

When once the unsoundness of this underlying conception of Pantheistic immanence has been detected, the whole fabric of Mr. Campbell's system crumbles. Still, there are further criticisms to which the details of this system lay themselves open, and to some of these we must advert.

At the head of this article we have placed some words of the late Dr. Martineau, in which he rebukes a practice now-a-days by no means uncommon. Mr. Campbell must be held to fall under this rebuke. We have heard him assure us that his New Theology is new only in a certain sense, and that his "objection is not so much to the venerable Creeds of Christendom" (the Athanasian included) "as to the ordinary interpretation of these Creeds." If such an assurance means anything it means that Mr. Campbell considers that the text of these Creeds is in harmony with his theology, and a suitable language by which to express it. Yet what is the case? These Creeds affirm the truth of a doctrine of the Trinity; so does Mr. Campbell's New Theology; but when that is said what other point of affinity is there between them? The Trinity of the Creeds is a Trinity of persons, communicating in the same nature and co-equal, though the Son proceeds from the Father and the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. The Trinity of Mr. Campbell's New Theology is a Trinity of one person in two states, one infinite, the other finite; and in one action, namely, of this one person as infinite on Himself as finite. In other words, the sole point of resemblance between the two is that each posits three elements in some way or other combining to form one. Why then take a name already appropriated to designate a theory altogether dissimilar? Why not devise another name out of the hundreds which are free of previous application?

Again, the venerable Creeds affirm the divinity of Jesus Christ. Mr. Campbell affirms that he does so too. But there is nothing in common between the sense in which the Creeds affirm it and that in which Mr. Campbell affirms it. The Creeds—and it is here no question of interpretations, but of formal statements—affirm that in the one person of Christ there are two distinct natures, one divine and the other human, with the implication—which no one would deny who knows the history under which the Creeds were elaborated—that to the

divine nature belongs an infinite, and to the human only a finite consciousness. Mr. Campbell rejects this dualism of natures altogether, denies that there is any infinite consciousness in Christ, and means by the divinity of his Christ something quite different, namely, that the life of Jesus was "the highest expression of divine love" that the world has yet seen. Moreover, and as a consequent of this primary opposition, the Creeds regard Christ as divine in a unique sense, with a divinity to which no one of us can ever aspire. On the other hand, Mr. Campbell teaches us that it is "quite a false idea to think of Jesus and no one else as the Son of God incarnate," and that in so doing "we make Him unreal, reduce His earthly life to a sort of drama, and effect a drastic distinction between Him and ourselves . . . (whereas) it is untrue to say that any such distinction exists . . . (since) we can rise towards Him by trusting, loving, and serving Him; and by so doing we shall demonstrate that we too are Christ the Eternal Son."¹ What is there in common between these two conceptions save the one term divinity which the Church has long since appropriated for one sense, and Mr. Campbell now wants to annex for its exact opposite?

Thirdly he lays himself open to the same reproach by his use of the word Atonement. The orthodox doctrine of Atonement is the doctrine that sin, being against God, violently disturbs the order of the divine justice in the universe, and that before forgiveness can be granted to the offender it is fitting for God to require that an adequate satisfaction for the outrage be made; further that a principal reason why our Lord became incarnate was that as the representative of our race He might make that satisfaction by the self-oblation of His own body on the Cross. Mr. Campbell's doctrine of Atonement is the doctrine that the self-sacrifice of one man on behalf of another tends to overcome that selfishness of sin which keeps men apart and degrades them to a lower moral level. Here it may be said that there is an affinity between the two conceptions, and so there is; but only in the sense that the spirit of self-sacrifice is the spirit which prompts to the whole category of ministrations for the welfare of others, and hence inclusively to that supreme deed of charity which is, by a sacrificial death, to make satisfaction to the outraged order of divine justice. But, though in this way one conception may

¹ P. 108.

lead up to the other, they are in themselves essentially different. Again, then, we ask why take a name which is appropriated to one conception and apply it to another which is quite different? That Mr. Campbell thinks the traditional conception intolerable does not justify him in robbing it of its acquired property in its name. However horrible it may be supposed to be, at least it has a right to a name to itself by which it can be known and distinguished from other things.

We might extend this comparison between the articles in the venerable Creeds and the New Theology of Mr. Campbell to other matters; for the entire conception of the Christian life which the Creeds express by such phrases as sin, the forgiveness of sin, salvation, judgment, resurrection is, as we have seen, essentially opposed to the conception which Mr. Campbell wishes to fasten on these terms; and the same may be said of the use of the term "religion," which he defines to mean not, as the Christian communities have ever held, the attitude of submission and worship which man should observe towards God, but "the recognition of an essential relationship between the human soul and the great whole of things of which it is the outcome and expression;"¹ or, again, of his idea of a virgin birth, which, in flagrant opposition to the idea which the Christian Church denotes by this name, he finds in the thought that "nothing great and noble in human experience can be accounted for merely in terms of atoms and molecules . . . (but) a Divine element, a spiritual quickening, is required for the evolution of anything God-like in our mundane sphere; it is a virgin birth . . . (and) this is the sense in which it is true that Jesus was of divine as well as human parentage."²

We repeat, then, the question, Why this practice of taking over words which have already acquired an accepted meaning in theological usage, and seeking to infuse into them a meaning quite different? If another were to set up a place of religious worship in the City, call it the City Temple, and call himself "the Rev. R. J. Campbell, a member of the Congregationalist denomination," the author of the *New Theology* would very naturally and properly protest. He would say it was an unwarrantable attempt to create confusion in the minds of those who might wish to hear him preach. And is it not just the same here? People listen to a preacher using language hallowed by centuries of Christian usage, and they imagine

¹ P. 16.² P. 106.

him to be meaning by it what other Christian preachers mean by it, and the result is that gradually and imperceptibly they find their religious ideas involved in hopeless confusion, and discover that in spite of themselves they have drifted far away from the cherished beliefs of their childhood. We would put it, then, to Mr. Campbell, Is it a legitimate method which leads to this disastrous confusion of thought, and would it not be much more becoming if, having unhappily discovered that he must renounce the fundamental beliefs of the Christian religion, he were to renounce also the names which have acquired a time-honoured association with them ; and to say distinctly that he does not now believe in the Trinity, or the Incarnation, or the Divinity of Christ, or His Atonement, or the Forgiveness of Sins, or the Rewards of Heaven, or the Resurrection of the Body, or in Religion, or in the Virgin Birth? Still, while we ask this of him in the name of what is right and becoming, we would not have him think that we fail to discern, and to respect, the motives by which, perhaps not consciously, he appears to have been actuated. His heart, it would seem, has been truer in its orientation than his head, and it cannot tolerate the thought of having to break away from the soul-healing "religious experience which came to the world through Jesus of Nazareth." Hence, the bias towards proffering that mode of Eirenicon which Dr. Martineau has pronounced vain.

Mr. Campbell lays himself open to a third criticism when he contends that the doctrinal system of the New Theology marks not so much a new departure in theology as a return to the original theology of the Christian Church. Of course he can reject as unauthoritative all that we find in the New Testament save such portions as, in his judgment, "ring true to his reason and moral sense;" and, then comparing the residue with his New Theology, pronounce that the latter is "an untrammelled return to the Christian sources in the light of modern thought." But a procedure so subjective is as unsafe as it is uncritical. It is true it can often be detected lurking beneath the surface of a good deal that is called Higher Criticism, but what it goes by is not a genuine species of internal evidence, and is especially out of place when it is question of estimating not the reality of recorded facts but the character of expressed beliefs. If, on the other hand, we take the New Testament as it stands—and so taken it is at least the presentation of the earliest form of Christian

belief known to us—it is very far indeed from agreeing with this New Theology. The New Theology knows of no salvation through the forgiveness of sins, no great white throne with Jesus Christ upon it as a Judge, no eternal distinction of lots, of heaven or hell, to be awarded according to the state of soul in which men depart from this life. And the New Testament, even if we needed to restrict our appeal to the Synoptic Gospels, insists on all these points. Jesus Christ Himself claims to forgive sins, declares that there will be a final judgment in which He will be the Judge, and warns His hearers to take heed in time, to keep their lamps ever burning, and their talents well employed, because on the issue of that final judgment will depend their eternal lot in heaven or hell. The New Theology denies that the gravity of sin is to be estimated by the offence it offers to God, or otherwise than by the injury it does to other men. But whilst one of the best known Psalms bids us say, "Against Thee, Thee only" (all other aspects of the offence counting as nothing in comparison with this one), "have I sinned," the Gospels, in absolute accord with this conception of sin, represent the prodigal son saying, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee," and elsewhere declare blasphemy against the Holy Ghost—a sin, that is to say, which is exclusively against God—to be so grave as to be (in whatever sense that is to be understood) unpardonable. The New Theology contends that Christ is God only in the sense of being the best of men; the Synoptic Gospels may not exhibit our Lord as declaring in so many words that He was God, but they do more, for they exhibit Him as taking up a position in regard to God and in regard to other men, which is unintelligible except on the supposition that He was God. For He claims to forgive sins in His own name, He claims to work miracles and even to raise the dead in His own name (quite unlike His Apostles, who when they work miracles use His name, not their own). He claims to be Lord of the Sabbath Day, He sets Himself before others as an example in a way which in any other than God would imply a really odious lack of humility, and He associates Himself with God in a unique manner, saying *My* Father, not—as He taught others to do—*our* Father. The New Theology rejects the idea of an Atonement in the sense of an expiation for sin, but what else than this can we get out of the words, "This is my Blood of the New Testament (*i.e.*, Covenant) which is shed for many for the remission

of sins."? The New Theology rejects the Trinity save in the unheard of sense above explained. In the Synoptics there is absolutely nothing of that kind, but a distinct assertion of the Trinity in the orthodox sense; for, if Christ is God we have already two distinct persons, and if other references to the Holy Ghost are less clear, at least in the Baptismal Form, with which the Gospel of St. Matthew ends, the Holy Ghost is placed in a relation to the Father and Son which is unintelligible if He be not the Third Person in the Godhead. The New Theology starts with a conception of divine immanence which we have shown to be Pantheistic. In no part of the Bible is there anything to sanction this, for the few phrases from St. John's Gospel which Mr. Campbell cites for this purpose, can only seem available for it when detached from their context. In Old Testament and New, in Gospels and Epistles, God is ever presented to us as a Being absolutely distinct from the world, and from the men whom He has created; as standing apart from though ever present to them; as claiming from them a worship and submission unintelligible if they be a part of Himself; and as proposing to them a final state in which they will not be absorbed into His being, but become His sons and His companions—admitted to His presence and society as the ransomed of Jesus Christ, and the good and faithful servants who have used their talents well.

S. F. S.

Laundry Work and Legislation.

IN receiving a deputation¹ of philanthropic societies desirous of pressing the subject upon his notice, the Home Secretary stated that the Government intended to introduce in the present session on the subject of laundries a Bill, of which the chief feature would be to bring within the scope of legislation and inspection the hitherto exempted conventional and institution laundries. Seeing that the fulfilment of this pledge is imminent, and that it will materially affect the interests of the very considerable number of convents which undertake laundry work by way of gain, it is important that Catholics, to whom the larger proportion of the institutions concerned belong, should thoroughly understand the facts of the case. These it is the business of the present article to make plain.

Laundry work appears to have been much later than other trades in developing beyond the stage of a domestic industry. As such, laundries were unregulated, except that they were subject to the Public Health Acts so far as their sanitary condition was concerned. Thus, although the long series of the Factory Acts began in 1801, it was not until 1895 that laundries were brought in any degree under the provisions of factory legislation in respect to hours of work, overtime, prevention of accidents, &c. This step was taken in consequence of evidence which showed among other things² that a girl of eighteen was employed eighty-six and often ninety hours a week (her wages were six shillings), and that women were often employed for periods which varied from fifteen to thirty-seven and a half hours at a stretch. The Act of 1895 brought the larger laundries under some sort of regulation, but in order to

¹ On Monday, March 19th, 1906, Mr. Gladstone received a deputation from the Women's Industrial Council and the Scottish Council for Women's Trades.

² *Women's Work in Laundries*: Report of an Inquiry conducted for the Scottish Council for Women's Trades. By Margaret H. Irwin, 58, Renfield Street, Glasgow. 7½d. post free. See also Charles Booth, *Life and Labour of the Poor*, vol. viii. pp. 254-267.

meet the opposition of the Irish Nationalist Party, all conventional and institution laundries, together with domestic laundries, were exempted from the Act. An attempt was made in 1899 both to improve the legislation with regard to laundries in general and to bring the institution laundries under some degree of control, but it met with the same opposition and failed again to overcome it. A third attempt was made in the centenary Factory and Workshop Act of 1901, which consolidated all previous legislation on the subject, but the clauses relating to laundries had to be abandoned, and the Bill, as it passed, reaffirmed the unfortunate provisions of the Act of 1895.

The law, then, stands thus: Laundries are divided into two classes: (1) steam laundries where mechanical power is used, and workshop laundries where only hand labour is employed. These are under the provisions of the section¹ relating to laundries in the Factory and Workshop Act of 1901. We shall see presently what these provisions amount to; (2) domestic laundries, *i.e.*, those where not more than two persons who are not members of the family are employed; and the laundries in which work only the inmates of prisons, reformatories, industrial schools, and of religious and charitable institutions in which laundry work is carried on for purposes of profit or gain. These are under no control other than that of the private individual or the institution official. For the first of these two classes, the steam and hand laundries, the law makes certain regulations on the subject of hours, overtime, and safety of life and limb. It will be easier if we consider these in the reverse order. With regard to sanitation and safety the chief provisions are the same as in factories and workshops generally. These regulate such matters as the number of sanitary conveniences to be supplied, the fencing of dangerous machinery, reporting of serious accidents, notification of infectious diseases, &c. In addition there are the following which are peculiar to laundries: When mechanical power is used, some artificial ventilation must be provided in ironing rooms and washhouses; stoves for heating irons must be separate from the ironing rooms; gas irons emitting noxious fumes must not be used, and the floors must be kept in good condition and so drained that the water flows off freely. Secondly, the overtime that may be worked is regulated as follows: No child or young person may work

¹ Section 103 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901. Eyre and Spottiswoode.
1s. 1d. post free.

overtime at all. A woman must not work more than a total of fourteen hours in any day, of which not more than two hours may be overtime; nor more than three days' overtime in any week; nor more than thirty days in any year. It is on the third subject, that of hours, that the radical difference in the protection extended by the law to those who work in laundries as against all other factories and workshops appears. For the law lays down that in a laundry a child may work as much as ten hours a day, though not more than thirty hours in a week; a young person (*i.e.*, under eighteen) may work as much as twelve hours in a day and up to sixty hours in a week; while a woman (*i.e.*, over eighteen) may work as much as fourteen hours in a day and up to sixty hours in a week, exclusive of overtime which, as stated above, may amount to an extra two hours' work three times a week during ten weeks in the year.

Let us take a concrete illustration. A woman may be legally employed in a laundry for a continuous stretch of sixteen hours on two days in every week throughout the year. That is to say, she may start at eight in the morning and continue till twelve midnight. Off this, two hours must be allowed for meals, but that leaves her fourteen hours of solid work, and meal hours are often irregularly observed or even curtailed for a rush of work. Two other days in the week she may work from eight in the morning till eight at night (twelve hours); on one day she may work from ten in the morning till eight at night (ten hours); and on another day she may work four hours. This total of seventy hours per week does not include overtime. With the amount of overtime allowed under the Act added to this, a woman may for ten weeks in the year work the following hours:

Monday	10 a.m. to	5 p.m.	=	7 hrs. less 1 meal hour	=	6 hrs' work
Tuesday	9 "	8 "	=	11 "	2 "	9 "
Wednesday	8 "	9 "	=	13 "	2 "	11 "
Thursday	8 "	12 mid.	=	16 "	2 "	14 "
Friday	8 "	12 "	=	16 "	2 "	14 "
Saturday	8 "	10 p.m.	=	14 "	2 "	12 "
Total	-	-		77	11	66

In trying to picture to oneself what these totals of fourteen and sixteen hours per day and seventy or seventy-seven per week which the law sanctions for laundry women, though it does not do so for any other class of worker, really mean, one must

remember how greatly the evils of the long hours are aggravated by the heavy nature of the work, the continuous standing, the damp floors, the handling and lifting of heavy irons, the temperature (in many cases eighty-six degrees), the fumes from gas stoves, the steam and damp of the wash-houses. And not only are the hours in themselves too long, but the Act, while saying that "a notice must be affixed in the laundry specifying the periods of employment and the times for meals," adds what it does not allow for any other trade, that "the period and times so specified may be varied before the beginning of employment on any day." By this unfortunate clause the law is rendered practically a dead letter. Its evasion becomes a simple matter when the Act defines the period of employment as a stretch of so many hours which may be taken at any time of the day or night, instead of limiting it, as in other industries, by two fixed points of a certain hour in the morning before which work may not begin, and a certain hour of the night after which it may not continue.¹ To give one illustration of the futility of inspection under this clause, an inspector may find work in full swing at midnight and be told that work did not begin that day till after noon, which brings the period of employment well within the legal limit. The inspector can only prove the truth of this statement by questioning the workers, and it is not fair that the whole onus of proving an evasion of the law on the part of their employers should be laid on them. Too often the giving of such evidence has led to dismissal.² Evasions of the law are common, and a competent observer remarks that where such evasion is not found it appears to be due principally to the fact that the employer does not know how easy it is to evade the provisions of the Act.³

Even in the laundry trade, the modern industrial development, which transfers the work from the small workshop to the big factory is noticeable, and the reports of the inspectors on the great steam laundries to be found in the larger towns show that it is to the interest of the trade to come up to and even to surpass the standard required by the law, and that the leading

¹ The hours are 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., or 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., or 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., with two hours for meals and Saturday half-holiday.

² See the fourth Annual Report (1897-8) of the Women's Industrial Council, for a case which came into court, and after which the four witnesses were promptly dismissed.

³ This paragraph is derived in substance from the Report of the Scottish Council referred to above.

employers¹ are willing that the legal restrictions necessary and practicable in other industries should be applied to their trade also. It is in the workshop laundries that the evils of bad sanitation and long hours are rampant. The following is a description of an unfavourable, though not uncommon, example of this class.

The ground floor of a small dwelling-house in a side street has been converted into a laundry by the simple process of placing a stove for heating the irons in the middle of the room, and setting some long narrow tables round the sides of it. The only ventilation is by the door, which, with the windows, is usually kept shut, in order that the drying of the rows and rows of clothes, hung overhead, may be proceeded with. The temperature is exceedingly high, vivified by gas and deteriorated by the crowded state of the apartment. The wash-house may be either a shed in a crowded back yard or a cellar under the house. There is no provision made for carrying off water from the floor, and the steam circles round the women who toil in these places, with the full permission of the law, for sixteen hours at a stretch, for in many cases the two hours for meals are purely mythical.²

Such are the conditions of employment in those laundries which have been brought within the terms of the Act. The conditions in all the small domestic laundries and in all institution laundries are, so far as the law is concerned, subject only to such safeguards as convenience or competition or the humanity of the employer may dictate. That is the state of things which the forthcoming legislation is designed to remedy. This, as we have seen, has two aims; to level up the standard of regulation for all laundries to that which prevails in other industries, and to bring the hitherto exempted domestic and institution laundries within the scope of this regulation.

Meanwhile, the Home Office, seeing the failure of the advocates of reform to secure what was necessary for the welfare of the workers by legislation,³ determined to proceed by informal administrative methods. A list was made of all religious and charitable institutions in which laundry work is done by way of gain, which, thanks to the kindness of Mr. T. G. King, of the Catholic Guardians' Association, became fairly complete,⁴ and

¹ See *The Power Laundry*, 3d. monthly, and Reports of the Inspectors *passim*.

² Report of the Scottish Council.

³ Abortive attempts were made in 1895, 1899, 1901, 1902, and 1905.

⁴ Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories for 1902, p. v.

in January, 1902, Mr. Ritchie, the then Home Secretary, sent to all these a circular stating that he

recognizes that modifications would be required in the provisions of the Factory Act to adapt them to the circumstances of institutions of this kind.¹ . . . He is anxious to ascertain whether any considerable number of institutions would be willing to receive visits from the Factory Inspector . . . if desired the visits would be made by the Lady Inspectors.

The provisions of the Act are then stated as we have given them above, and the Home Secretary thinks, and we are sure all readers of *THE MONTH* will agree with him that

the hours allowed by the Act are such as can hardly be exceeded without overtaxing the strength of the persons employed, and that the other requirements referred to do not go beyond what may reasonably be looked for in a well-regulated laundry, irrespective of statutory obligation.²

The Home Office published the response to this circular in 1905.³ The numbers are as follows: one hundred and sixty-one institutions accepted this measure of voluntary inspection, or at any rate an informal visit from an inspector. Eighty-eight, or more than half, are Catholic convents, and of these fifty-six accepted the inspection, thirty-two the visits of the inspectors. Of the sixty-nine which did not accept either inspection or visits, thirty-five are Anglican, eighteen "other," and sixteen are Catholic. Of these sixteen Catholic convents, eight are in England, one in Scotland, and seven in Ireland. It is interesting to note that preference for the lady inspector was expressed by ten Anglican, three "other," and two Catholic institutions.⁴

It is the result of this voluntary inspection that we must now consider. The reports, scattered up and down in the pages of the Annual Reports of the Factory Inspectors are summarized by H.M. Chief Inspector in the following words:

The result . . . was, on the whole, most satisfactory. With few exceptions, the conditions were found to be such as to satisfy the

¹ E.g., a private Bill introduced by Mr. Cameron Corbett, M.P., in 1905 contained a clause which in the case of institution laundries allowed the certifying surgeon of health and accidents to be the medical officer attached to the institution instead of the divisional surgeon appointed to the district under the Act.

² Annual Report for 1902, p. xxiv.

³ *List of Religious and Charitable Institutions in which laundries are carried on.* Second issue, Home Office, 1905, Cd. 2741, 2*d.* post free.

⁴ Annual Report for 1902, p. v.

requirement of the Act in essentials, and the advice given by the inspectors, where improvement in such points as fencing of machinery and separation of stoves was needed, was welcomed by those in charge.¹

The following reports are quoted in full, and may be taken as typical :

Captain Kindersley (Edinburgh) reports that he has visited four of these during the year, and in every case any suggestions he had to make were adopted. Mr. Robinson (Glasgow) visited one convent laundry and two belonging to charitable institutions and found the buildings large and airy, ventilation and drainage of floors good, hours of work comparatively short, power-driven machinery fairly well fenced. On the whole they compared favourably with any of the public factory laundries in his district. Mr. Newlands (Aberdeen) visited only one convent laundry. The few suggestions he made were immediately adopted. The laundry was generally in a good condition. He has been asked to visit it every time he is in that part of his district. As Mr. Bellhouse (Dublin) has visited a number of convent laundries, the Chief Inspector writes—I give his report in full: “I have had an opportunity during the year of visiting a good many of these places by invitation, and I have been enormously impressed by the excellent arrangements that are made in all of them for the workers. In no case have I found any instance of excessive hours, the regulations as to holidays are fully met by the observance of all the Church holidays; the only point in which there is not absolute compliance in this respect being in connection with the compulsory Easter holiday. This is never observed, but the want of it is more than counterbalanced by the extra number of other days which are observed instead. I have always found the rooms to be exceedingly well ventilated, high, lofty, bright, and airy; the wash-house floors are always admirably laid and drained. In those places where machinery is used I have been surprised to see how well it has been guarded, and how well the ventilating fans have been arranged. Much of the opposition to the Factory Act on the part of these institutions has been due to ignorance of what the law might mean to them. They have been afraid that we might interfere with their religious ceremonies by binding them to certain definite and unalterable hours, but I have always carefully explained matters and pointed out that they were as a matter of fact already complying to the fullest extent with all the provisions of the Act, and that its application to them could make no possible difference in their arrangements. I do not believe that there is any opposition to, or feeling against visits by an inspector, male or female. In this district they are already well accustomed to such visits, for there is nearly always attached to the convent either an Industrial, National, or Technical School, to which visits are paid by Government Officials, or the convent is under the

¹ Annual Report for 1902, p. v.

control of the Congested Districts Board, and subject to visits by officials from them. My experience is that a very hearty welcome is always offered by the Reverend Mother and the nuns, who seem only too anxious to show everything about the premises."¹ Mr. Shuter (Plymouth): "The buildings are admirably suited for the purpose for which they are used, being lofty, well lighted and well ventilated. The greatest attention is paid to cleanliness, limewashing, etc., while the hours worked are very few compared with those permitted by law in other laundries. The inmates present a most comfortable appearance, and so far as I have been able to judge, these laundries have nothing whatever to fear from being placed under ordinary inspection." Mr. Bremner-Davis (North London): "In the matters of sanitation, protection of dangerous machinery and conditions of employment they varied from fair to good. For the most part, though quite willing to adopt the precautions recommended, they were unacquainted with the existence of many practical ways of preventing danger. No man can be judge in his own case. It is a common experience to find an incommodeous, ill-ventilated factory, crowded with ill-guarded machinery, extolled by its proud owner as almost a paragon of Factory Act virtues."²

In order to complete this review of the subject, there are yet three points which call for brief mention, though they are outside the main purpose of this article. In the first place the numbers concerned in this industry are very considerable indeed. According to the Census of 1901, there were in England and Wales 196,141 females as against 8,874 males employed in laundry work. Of these only 82,000 women are in the 7,021 registered laundries; those in the unregulated laundries are therefore more numerous. Only thirty per cent. are under twenty-five years of age, the enormous majority being married women or widows, for whom this trade is the great resource. Comparing these figures with the total number of women engaged in occupations of all sorts, it appears that about one in twenty is a laundry worker. It is therefore no inconsiderable section of the population which is suffering for lack of better legislation. Secondly, those who have taken the trouble personally to investigate the other class of unregulated laundries, the domestic laundries (*i.e.*, those where not more than two workers dwelling elsewhere are employed) tell us that in these the lowest level in sanitation is usually to be found. The washing and ironing are done in the kitchen, where the ordinary life of the family goes on side

¹ Annual Report for 1902, p. 137.

² *Ibid.* for 1905, p. 49; see also pp. 256-265.

by side with it, and the clothes are dried in the room where they are washed. More than once the proprietress has frankly admitted having reduced her staff to two in order that her laundry being outside the scope of the Act, she might work as long as she liked. Another said "every laundry in the street may be working different hours and changing them every day too."

The following are the hours worked in a typical laundry of this class. Monday was idle; on Tuesday and Wednesday they worked from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. (11 hours' work), the remaining three days of the week, work began at 6.30 a.m. and ended at 10 p.m., a stretch of 15½ hours' work. Employers urge that these evils are largely due to a habit on the part of the public of delaying to send their work early in the week. The small laundries have to take their work just when people choose to bring it in; much of the work is only dressing clothes which people have washed for themselves, and "working people living in tenements must do their washing when it's their turn of the wash-house." It is a fresh instance of the way in which all the problems of poverty are bound up together. Work is carried on in spurts, and as long as shamefully long hours alternate with days of idleness, the worker cannot be expected to develop any qualities but those of the casual labourer. The conditions force the temptation to drink. The employer usually provides two half-pints of beer a day, and to facilitate further purchases, wages are often paid daily. Those who are interested in temperance might take the matter up from this point of view, and urge that some drink such as barley or oatmeal water should be provided, as is done for men in certain trades where the nature of the work requires it. The irregular hours and the late hour of the return from work is highly inconvenient and destructive of family and social life, as well as of health. It must be remembered that the workers are mostly mothers of families. This class of worker is specially liable to consumption, rheumatism, and anaemia. In the unregulated laundries there is no certifying surgeon to test the workers' fitness, and whatever her condition she may go on till she breaks down or meets with an accident through falling fainting on the machinery. Only girls of the rougher sort take up the work, and their hours make it difficult to do for them through the clubs what is done for other workers. Yet the industry, if properly organized, would be capable of offering really desirable employment to

skilled workers, instead of being, as it too often is, the last resort of the idle and intemperate.

We are wont to vaunt our factory system as against that of other nations, but it must be borne in mind that England is behind Germany and Belgium, and very far indeed behind France in the condition of its laundries.¹ With regard to the special point, in the first two, laundries are not often undertaken by convents as they are here, while in France they have for years been under the same regulations as other factories, and laundries, of whatever type, are treated alike. Not even the bogey of foreign competition can be urged against regulation in this trade.

It remains to consider briefly the long-deferred legislation which will probably be before the House by the time this paper appears. It will, we hope, be found to contain provisions for safety and sanitation, drainage and ventilation, and for diminishing and regulating the hours during which women may be employed in laundries. It may be expected to recognize frankly, in view of certain national customs, and of the fact that in this industry the work is both taken in and given out in the same week or even in the same day, that it is impossible at present, however desirable it may be, to force the whole body of employers to adopt the same regular hours that are observed in other industries where work is not done weekly for the convenience of the public. To attempt this would be to give the whole trade into the hands of the owners of large steam laundries, since they alone could so organize the work as to make absolutely regular hours possible. It would also be to inflict great hardship on the poorer members of the public. The forthcoming legislation will probably allow longer hours on certain days in the week counterbalanced by correspondingly shorter hours on other days. But whatever arrangement is made to secure that elasticity which is necessary in the interests of the public, the vital point is that the hours should be definitely fixed and notified to the Home Office. An inspector will then be able to discover whether the Act is more honoured in the breach than the observance, which is not possible under the present system where hours may be changed from day to day. At any rate, it will no longer be possible for women to spend sixteen hours, and fourteen hours actually at work, in a laundry.

¹ Annual Report for 1902, pp. 194—206, *passim*.

The Government Bill will further render obligatory the inspection to which nearly all laundries in religious and charitable institutions have of late voluntarily submitted, by bringing them under the provisions of the Act. It should be premised that such inspection is *desired* by those ultimately responsible for Catholic institutions, and we understand that this is true also of the majority of Anglicans. It is further *desired* that in regard to sanitation, safety, and notification of hours, the same provisions should apply to charitable as to commercial laundries. But there are differences between a commercial undertaking run for profit, and employing paid workers who can leave or be dismissed at any time, and an institution whose aim is to benefit those who have taken refuge there, and who are not paid, but lodged, fed, taught, and assisted. Legislation which failed to recognize these differences would be inept indeed. The points on which elasticity is desired may be summarized briefly as follows: (1) That institutions should be obliged to give as many holidays as are ordered by the Act to be given in commercial enterprizes, with the same power to substitute two half-holidays for a whole one, but that they should be free to choose the dates of their own holidays, subject to notification to the authority. It is manifestly undesirable that members of a reformatory should be given a holiday on a Bank Holiday. (2) That the legal limit of hours to be worked in any day or week should be adhered to, but that greater elasticity should be allowed as to the hours within which work may be done, say between 6 a.m. and 9 p.m instead of the 6 to 6, or 7 to 7, or 8 to 8 of the ordinary factory. Unless this were allowed, it would be very difficult to arrange for the ordinary family life of the Home, needlework, housework, religious services, recreation, &c. (3) That, where qualified, the medical adviser of the Home should be the certifying surgeon. The regular attendant will necessarily know more about the inmates and their work than the surgeon appointed to the district under the Act, and his periodical visits would cause less disturbance to the workers. (4) That the notice boards with the regulations and the invitation to address complaints to the inspectors should not be compulsorily posted in the laundry, and that the inmates should not be examined in private by the inspector except in special cases by order of the Home Secretary. The reasons for this can be fully apparent only to those who have themselves done rescue and penitentiary work.

But the first object of such institutions is to guard the workers against themselves, and not to put temptations to untruthfulness and vindictiveness in their way. Workers in a commercial laundry can be fined or dismissed ; in an institution the only resource under such circumstances would be to send the inmate away, which would defeat the very object for which the Home exists.

There are some who would prefer that the inspection should take place not under the Factory Department of the Home Office, but under the Reformatory and Industrial Schools Department, and it is certain that there are enough institutions to employ fully one or two inspectors. But whichever way this matter is settled, it is certainly desirable that the inspectorate should qualify for this special branch of its work. As it seems both unnecessary and expensive that the same persons and work should be inspected both as a laundry and as a reformatory, it would be desirable that legislation affecting such institutions should be codified in a separate Act or section of an Act to prevent overlapping, and to ensure that managers, matrons, and the inspectorate shall clearly know the requirements. These are the points on which separate treatment may reasonably be expected. It would be well if every man or woman who has the interests of the institutions at heart would write *at once* to the M.P. for the constituency in which they live enclosing the leaflet¹ from which this summary has been taken, and asking him to make a special effort to secure legislation on these lines.

To conclude, it has been shown that the late Conservative Government made repeated and strenuous efforts to effect these most necessary reforms, and that the present Liberal Government has undertaken to achieve them. Whatever our politics may be, justice requires that we should unite to gain a measure of relief for those to whose toilsome service we are each one of us personally indebted.

LUCY WYATT PAPWORTH.

¹ To be had of the Secretary, Reformatory and Refuge Union, 117, Victoria Street, S.W.

Ferdinand Brunetière.

THE premature death of M. Ferdinand Brunetière on the 9th of December last, has deprived the Catholic cause in France of one of its most energetic and able champions.

While fully recognizing the great services which M. Brunetière has rendered to French literary criticism, we may safely assert that his true vocation was realized in his more philosophical works. These give us the key to his life,—the life of a Catholic thoroughly imbued with a practical sense of the dangers, both intellectual and moral, which menaced the religion he had embraced.

M. Brunetière was a self-made man. He owed his advancement entirely to his own merits, which eventually won for him that crowning reward, a seat among the immortal forty of the French Academy. But as Catholics we may see in M. Brunetière something more than a man who has climbed the ladder of fame from its lowest rung. He was also a profound thinker who worked his way from Positivism to the Catholic Church, and has left us a method of apologetics which may prove of great service in the future. The aim of his whole life might be summed up in his own words: "*Faisons de l'histoire des problèmes une introduction à leur solution.*" And in his conversion¹ we have but the result of his practical fidelity to this rule.

I.

Ferdinand Brunetière was born at Toulon in the year 1849. He came to Paris at the age of twenty, and studied at the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, preparing for his entrance examination to the École Normale. His talents, however, were not of a nature to do themselves justice in general competition. He was a brilliant essayist and speaker, but his want of familiarity

¹ We have used the word "conversion" throughout to describe M. Brunetière's practical acceptance of the truth of the Catholic faith.

with Greek led to his rejection, and that at a school where his lectures some sixteen years later were to win for him a European reputation.

His literary studies were for the moment interrupted by the outbreak of the war of 1870, during which he saw active service in one of the infantry regiments. He returned after the war to Paris, where he had to earn his living as a "coach" in an establishment for preparing young men for the *baccalaureat*. His friend, Paul Bourget, who was associated with him in the Academy, and had been a fellow-student of his at the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, was also on the teaching staff of this crammers'. He gives us the following graphic account of the drudgery which fell to Brunetière's lot during this period.¹ He arrived in the morning, we are told, at half-past eight, and gave two classes of an hour and a half each. He returned at three to give a further hour's lecture; and this without vacation every week-day throughout the year. What time he could spare from the correction of papers and the preparation of his lectures he devoted to writing for the reviews, in order to eke out the miserable pittance of six pounds a month which he received for his work at the *Institut Lelarge*. We gain some insight into the gigantic energy of the man when we remember that it was during this period that he acquired that vast erudition which all his writings betray.

Between the ages of twenty and twenty-five [he told a representative of the *Temps*] my interest was exclusively confined to the history of religion. During this time I worked up my Greek by myself, and studied Sanscrit for a year, without mastering it, at the *école des hautes études*, which had just been opened under the direction of M. Hauvette-Besnault.

It was at this time, too, that he contracted the habit of sitting up at night reading, often until four in the morning, deep in thought, and utterly oblivious of his surroundings. And yet he would be at his post to begin his lecture by half-past eight. It was after some two or three years of this drudgery that he was introduced by his friend, Paul Bourget, to the editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and was invited to accept the post of literary critic on the staff of that review. In his work as a critic his remarkable gift of judgment was universally recognized. This sphere of activity was entirely congenial to his talents,

¹ Cf. letter in *Le Temps* for December 11, 1906.

and in giving him the opportunity of putting his views before the public it gave him all that was necessary to secure the success of his work.

Within our present limits we can only afford to enumerate the more important posts which he filled. It was in 1886 that M. Liard offered him the appointment of *Maitre des Conférences* at the École Normale, though in so doing he broke with the tradition which required that all professors at the École Normale should be chosen from the ranks of those holding special diplomas in the various faculties. M. Brunetière, however, more than justified the confidence thus placed in him. On the death of M. Lemoine in 1893 he was elected a member of the Academy, receiving in the first ballot twenty-two votes as against four for his opponent, who was no less a person than M. Émile Zola. In the same year he was offered the post of editor of the review for which he had formerly written as literary critic.

He was thus at the same time the editor of an influential periodical, a lecturer at the École Normale, and a very able and energetic public speaker. He himself gives us the secret of this prodigious activity. The difficulties with which his early life had been beset inclined him to a severe view of the world, and for some time he was drawn towards the rigorous teachings of Jansenism. His tendencies were pessimistic, and in order to free himself from his own recollections, he spent himself in work night and day.

Si je ne m' écrasais pas de travail, je mourrais de chagrin devant la couleur de mes méditations.

Religion was, however, the consolation of the last decade of his life. Throughout that life he had always thrown himself body and soul into the "actual" problems of the hour. In his critical work he invariably brought out the possibilities of the ideas with which he dealt.

It was when lecturing at the Sorbonne on Bossuet's *Variations of Protestantism* that he was drawn to the Church of Rome. Briefly, his reason for embracing Catholicism was that he perceived clearly the necessity of religion for the social progress of mankind, and saw that no religion could further this progress so well as Catholicism. In 1905, he gave the following account of himself in the *Temps*:

It was undoubtedly my study of the seventeenth century that led me to the question of morality and religion. I had sought to find

some means of constructing a *morale laïque*. In my quest I began by appreciating the difficulties. Then I saw that my project was perhaps even more rash than difficult. And finally, I realized that it was impossible. I therefore fell back upon the idea of religion. I had lived until then in a state of indifference or carelessness with respect to these questions, but I now felt that, if there was one thing which was utterly impossible, it was to preach the idea of religion from without, as a politician, without professing it oneself from the bottom of one's heart.

Even before his conversion he had paid a visit to His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII., and on his return he published an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, entitled, "Après une visite au Vatican," which indicated clearly the direction in which his thoughts were tending. It was in 1898 that he delivered at Besançon his famous discourse on "*Le besoin de croire*," in which he announced his intention of joining the Church. From this time forward he devoted himself to a regular campaign throughout France, and even in Belgium, Holland, Italy, and Switzerland. Towards the close of 1901 he had the courage to deliver a lecture at Geneva on Calvin, and was well received by the University authorities. Many of these admirable lectures are collected in his *Discours de Combat*, which give us the substance of his apologetic.

He did not endeavour to show to what extent the Church could modify itself to suit the prevailing spirit of democracy, but his object was to prove that the element of truth in other systems led up to the Catholic Church. It was on the data of Positivism that he laid the foundation of this his great thesis. Comte had attempted to construct a social edifice in which the "harmony of intellects" should create a civic harmony, order, and progress.¹ Comte's dream was an after-image of Catholicism, and M. Brunetière set himself to bring into relief the affinities of Catholicism and Positivism. In his own words, he "utilized Comte."

In the foregoing pages an attempt has been made to give a rough outline of the general tenor of M. Brunetière's work. He was a man of intense sympathies, but his criticism was always dispassionate. Though never possessed of robust health, he had an unbounded store of energy, and was never sparing in his use of it in the good cause which he supported so resolutely. Of him it has been said that the Church has secured no more valued adherent since the conversion of Newman.

¹ Cf. the admirable tribute to his old master by M. Georges Goyau in *La Revue Hebdomadaire*, December 15, 1906.

II.

It will help us to get a clearer notion of M. Brunetière's apologetics if we examine very briefly a work upon which he was engaged when death came to put an end to his labours. The scheme was to be completed in three stages, but, unfortunately, only the first stage—*The Utilization of Positivism*—has yet been published. Most of the material, however, for the completion of the work must have been collected and arranged, and it is to be hoped that steps will be taken to secure their publication. The second stage was designed to remove the difficulties against faith, and the third was to establish the transcendence of Christianity.

The first stage, *The Utilization of Positivism*, is made up of two parts; the one dealing with his method and leading up to the other. The first is critical, the second constructive. Positivism, the philosophy of facts, is in possession, and M. Brunetière's object is to use Positivism against itself: to vindicate the necessity of religion, making use of the very premisses of those who thought to dispense with religion but did not succeed in doing so.

It is a commonplace now-a-days to oppose science to religion. M. Brunetière does not pretend to show that such opposition does not exist; quite the contrary. But he points out that Positivism has only been able to work itself out by bringing a religion into requisition,—the "religion of humanity." He does not wish, for the present, to pass any judgment on that religion, but only to emphasize the fact that the most scientific and undoubtedly the least religious of philosophies in history has been unable to detach itself from the idea of religion.

We will look to Comte's premisses, then, to establish for us two facts: first, that morality can neither be justified nor maintained independently of religion, and secondly that such religion cannot be individual, but is necessarily social and based upon the affirmation of the supernatural. This method of course leaves untouched a large number of fundamental questions. But let it be remembered that this work is but a stage on the road that leads to faith.

With regard to the method pursued, M. Brunetière has been much criticized by the disciples of Comte, by theologians, and by the philosophical world in general.

Comte's disciples [he says] regarded me as too half-hearted: theologians objected that I went too far. Lynx-eyed philosophers, while they perceived that I had made bold to draw from Comte's premisses conclusions which were not exactly his, did not give themselves the trouble of proving that my conclusions were either illegitimate or false. They simply contented themselves with the protest that these were not Comte's conclusions,—nor their own. And of this I was perfectly well aware.

The aim of his Preface is to justify his position by removing misunderstandings. His object is not to explain Comte. If it were, he would have to take Comte's system as a whole. But the sole function of a system is not that it should be analyzed, synopsized, and catalogued in history. The historic method is not the only method. It might be well enough if systems did not contain ideas which, of their very nature, tended to work themselves out in motor ideas. No modern philosopher has consecrated himself to his studies solely for the pleasures of philosophy, nor for the joy, high and pure as it is, of the search for truth. All, even the most disinterested, have had as their object to influence contemporary ideas, and, by this means, to act upon the future destiny of mankind.

M. Brunetière is thus fully justified in his endeavour to detach from the system which he studied the *âme de vérité* (to use the phrase of M. Ollé Lapruné), and as far as method is concerned, it must be admitted by all that he has been most faithful to Comte's principles.

My great claim is that I have faithfully followed his method, in so far as it consists in starting from facts, in seeing in the fact no more than a fact, and finally of never generalizing save within the limits of fact.

It is by these methods that M. Brunetière sets out to prove the necessity of religion. The position which he is combating is that taken up by men like Renan, who, in his work entitled *L'Avenir de la Science*, proclaims it as the object of science to "explain man: that is, to give him in the name of the only legitimate authority, viz., human nature taken in its entirety, the symbol which religions gave him ready made, but which he can no longer accept." It was on account of the failure of science to make good what was thus promised in her behalf by her authorized exponents, that M. Brunetière spoke of "the bankruptcy of science."

This expression called forth considerable protest on the part of men of science, and involved M. Brunetière in a long discussion with the famous chemist, the late M. Berthelot. But

in the main M. Brunetière was quite justified in his assertion. So great an authority as Professor Paulsen has, in one of his recent works, made similar statements without encountering any opposition.

In recent years [writes Professor Paulsen] . . . an undercurrent of hostility to the scientific activity of our universities has made itself felt in many ways. Something like disappointment is perceptible because scientific research does not seem to redeem its promise to supply a complete and certain theory of the universe, and a practical world-wisdom founded in the very necessity of thought. Former generations had been supplied with such conceptions by religion or theology. Philosophy inherited this place in the eighteenth century. With what hopeful joy the generations of Voltaire and Frederick looked up to it! Hegel was the last heir of pure reason. Then a new generation, as distrustful of reason as the former had been of faith, turned to science with the expectation that exact research would place us upon a sure footing, and supply us with a true theory of the world. But this science cannot do.

For the *Utilization of Positivism* both Spencer's "Unknowable" and Comte's *religion de l'humanité* are brought to give their testimony to the fact that science cannot provide a substitute for religion. At this stage of the inquiry any philosophical difficulties as to the representation of the "Unknowable" are of secondary importance.

Do not let us confuse issues [says M. Brunetière]. All that I wished to establish here was that the theory of the "Unknowable" provides a basis or scientific foundation for religion. We find God again at the end of the most laborious and conscientious attempt to dispense with Him.

Comte's real contradiction was his attempt to realize the Unknowable,—to give it a concrete form in humanity. Humanity is not the Unknowable, and the word religion loses its meaning where we propose ourselves as the object of our adoration. The "religion of humanity" is no religion.

This much, however, of Comte's conception may be retained with advantage, namely, that those alone are qualified to give precision and depth to our notion of the "Unknowable" who regard the destiny of mankind as the principal object of their study. Such men will not be solicitous for art or science in themselves, but rather for the services which art and science can render to the moral education of mankind. Finally, such men will endeavour to develop, strengthen, and perfect that social solidarity which is a fundamental characteristic of man.

III.

But little space remains in which to treat of the second portion of M. Brunetière's book. It is here that his constructive genius is seen to its best advantage; for he has now to erect his edifice of morals and religion upon the foundation of social requirements.

Comte's Positivism, he says, implies a religion which knits together her human society. It is a fact that all religion is necessarily a "community of beliefs." We do not make our religions for ourselves; an individual religion would be a contradiction in terms. The word "religion," just as much as the word "family" or "country," involves a collective idea. But it is only in the Catholic Church that this notion of a community of beliefs can find its fullest realization.

This portion of his these, namely, the social character of religion, M. Brunetière illustrates further by showing that persecutions have in history invariably taken the form of a crusade in the interests of existing society. Our Lord Himself was a disturber of the people. It is this fact which constitutes the difficulty, or, speaking humanly, the impossibility of converting to Christianity a people like the Chinese. The Chinese religion is eminently a social code, and conversion would involve a change in the constitution of society.

So, too, every religion that ceases to be a society ceases to be a religion. Where the social bond of union is destroyed, the break-up of religion inevitably follows. What, indeed, were the causes of the great wave of irreligion which swept over Europe in the sixteenth century? Was it that there suddenly arose in the minds of men intellectual difficulties with regard to the truths of the ancient faith, which up to that moment had been felt by none? So it is sometimes said, but not by those who have fullest knowledge of the literature of that period. Science and higher criticism are of too recent growth to have been responsible for the movement. It has often been attributed, and with a great degree of truth, to the revolt of the younger generation, brought up in the pagan atmosphere of the prevalent Humanism, against the severer morality of the Gospel. But far more importance, in this connection, is to be attached to what Comte has aptly termed *la grande maladie occidentale*. It was the Protestant assertion of individualism which, by severing social ties, took the initial step towards the total destruction of the idea of religion. There is an indissoluble connection between religion and the social organization. For this reason

the task which the present Government in France has set itself is in open contradiction with the national motto, *Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*. In his chapter on "Religion as Sociology" M. Brunetière points out the real source of the persecution which is at present in progress.

We have the inalienable right [he says] to think differently from the State. But, since religion is indispensable, the State reserves the right to banish or suppress us if our way of thinking differs from its own. But why is religion indispensable? Because without it the State ceases to be a State—an organized society—a body whereof the citizens are but the members. It becomes an aggregate of disparate elements, heterogeneous, hostile—in a word, the very opposite of all that is implied in the notion of a State. A lay State can remain a State only on condition of its making a religion of itself and of the sum of the methods which it regards as best calculated to guarantee its own continuance.

Thus the ultimate connection between the social question and the idea of religion is an established fact.

It is even more obvious that morality is indissolubly bound up with religion. Morality is but the sum of the principles which govern human conduct. Whence are we to derive these principles if not from the idea we have of our destiny? There may, indeed, be a science of ethics, but there can be no sort of ethics founded on science. Faith is the ultimate foundation of all morality.

The results, therefore, of the second part of the *Utilization of Positivism* may be thus summed up. The social tendency is a fact of our nature. Examine what society implies. It necessarily postulates a code of morality. Morality is thus a second established fact. But is it an ultimate fact? Does it contain its own explanation? No, it does not, for morality is founded on religion.

Here, for the present, we must take our leave of M. Brunetière. It may be that some will put away his work with the feeling that the conclusions arrived at are too meagre and shadowy, too vague and illusive to further the interests of religion. But we must bear in mind that M. Brunetière's message is not directed primarily to those who are already firmly established in their Faith as Catholics. Yet they, too, may have something to learn from his work. It will teach them sympathy with the needs and aspirations of others, so that they may aid those who still grope darkly amid images and shadows, and guide their faltering steps along the road that leads to Faith.

MARCUS K. AMBROSE.

Galileo.

THAT in the Case of Galileo the authorities of the Catholic Church incontestably proved themselves to be the implacable enemies of science and determined opponents of its discoveries, is a commonplace with anti-Catholic and even non-Catholic writers. It appears to be assumed as a patent fact requiring no proof, that when the Inquisition instituted proceedings against the inventor of the telescope, the head and front of his offending was his introduction of the experimental method into the study of nature and the doubt he thus ventured to cast upon the time-honoured doctrines which had so long been accepted in the schools, and which the Pope and Cardinals were determined to uphold. It seems, indeed, to be thought that the old geocentric astronomy was regarded as an article of faith which they were resolved at all hazards to force upon the acceptance of mankind, as a matter of no less importance than the Apostles' Creed itself. Mr. Morley tells us, for example,¹ that the "intellectual insurgents," of whom he finds a type in Abelard, "could have taught Europe earlier than the Church allowed it to learn, that the sun does not go round the earth, and that it is the earth which goes round the sun." This clearly means that any one who was left at liberty to think for himself must of course have perceived the truth of the matter, and that only ecclesiastical tyranny could have prevented its recognition,—although it cannot have been this which hid it from the acute minds of Aristotle and Ptolemy.

It is as demonstrating this supposed anti-scientific temper of Churchmen that the case of Galileo is of real importance,—but as Cardinal Newman characteristically observes,² this very case suffices to prove that the Church has *not* set herself against scientific progress, for this is "the one stock argument" to the contrary, the exception which proves the rule.

¹ *Diderot*, p. 3.

² *Apologia*, c. v.

Nor is Newman here alone. One who can be so little suspected of Catholic sympathies as Professor Augustus De Morgan, draws the same conclusion.

The Papal power [he writes]¹ must upon the whole have been moderately used in matters of philosophy, if we may judge by the great stress laid on this one case of Galileo. It is the standing proof that an authority which has lasted a thousand years was all the time occupied in checking the progress of thought. There are certainly one or two other instances, but those who make most of the outcry do not know them.

It is worth while, therefore, to examine this particular case with some care, in order to determine what was the motive which led to the prosecution of Galileo, and how far this was actuated by a desire to obstruct the progress of science.

It is, of course, unquestionable that Galileo was prosecuted before the Roman Inquisition, on account of the astronomical novelties which he championed, and no attempt will here be made to deny that those who so prosecuted him made a great and deplorable mistake, and did their utmost to compromise ecclesiastical authority, by endeavouring to make it the judge of scientific truth, a function altogether alien from its character, which it was not competent to exercise.² Their error arose from the belief long dominant in Christendom, that the Scriptures literally interpreted were meant to be the supreme test of truth, human no less than Divine. Galileo's doctrines appeared reprehensible and dangerous, not because they promised to enlarge the domain of human knowledge, but because they appeared likely to unsettle the belief of the Christian people—especially of the uneducated masses—in the Bible, and consequently in religion altogether, which a great wave of scepticism already threatened to submerge, and, although such a consideration does not avail to justify the course adopted, it cannot be denied that, whilst on the one hand the dangers apprehended were real and substantial, the gain to the human race of substituting Copernican-

¹ Article "Motion of Earth" in *English Cyclopaedia* and *Penny Cyclopaedia*.

² We are not now considering the Case of Galileo in its theological aspect, nor inquiring how far Papal infallibility should be held to be involved in the decision of the Inquisitors. An observation of Professor De Morgan may however be noted. "It is clear," he writes, "that the absurdity was the act of the Italian Inquisition, for the private and personal pleasure of the Pope—who knew that the course could not convict him as *Pope*—and not of the body which calls itself the *Church*. Let the dirty proceeding have its right name." (*Budget of Paradoxes*, p. 60.)

ism for the old Ptolemaic system was by no means so evident. It is easy in this matter to exaggerate the practical effect of Galileo's teaching, and many persons appear to assume that those who held the geocentric theory must have been in every respect as ignorant of science as Hottentots or Fuegians. No doubt, it was very sad that men should continue to think that the sun moved and the earth stood still: but, after all, such an erroneous supposition, while it no wise affected men's lives, did nothing to hinder progress in directions in which humanity was far more vitally concerned, and in which it has never been pretended that the Church manifested any hostility to it. Some of the greatest steps in human development had already been taken by men who believed as firmly as the Inquisitors themselves in the old astronomy of Alexandria. By such men printing had been invented, introducing a new factor in human affairs, in comparison with which all astronomical systems and theories were as nothing. The New World had been discovered, and the road by the Cape to India opened up by mariners who never doubted that the globe they traversed was fixed and immovable in the centre of space. In the domain of practical astronomy itself, eclipses could be accurately predicted, and Columbus on a famous occasion overawed the American Indians by announcing such an occurrence and the exact time when it would happen. The reformed Calendar which we still employ was the work of men who, living after Copernicus, rejected his system. Nor is there any reason to suppose that had the old astronomy continued in honour, it would have blocked the way for the discovery of the steam-engine or the telegraph, or for advances in geology, chemistry, or biology. It did not even, as already said, enable eclipses and other celestial phenomena to be more accurately predicted. It was only as a theory, recommended by its beauty and simplicity, that the Copernican system really added to the store of human knowledge, and we shall see that as a theory there was never any objection to its being promulgated. On the other hand, the unsettlement of religious belief was undoubtedly a serious matter,—in the eyes of those who held the Catholic Faith for the most vital of all verities, it was the most serious of all matters, and however ill-advised were the efforts made to safeguard religion, it can hardly be said with any show of truth that their motive was hostility to science. On the contrary, however erroneously, Galileo's judges believed

themselves to be maintaining the cause of *true* science, against its counterfeit presentment. For, as will be seen, the traditional doctrine of centuries was but slowly eliminated, and the Inquisitors did but represent the views held by many whom we still honour as leaders of scientific thought.

Before speaking of Galileo we must study the history of his great predecessor, Copernicus, his senior by about a century.¹ Copernicus was a cleric, probably a priest, certainly a canon of Ermeland, at one time administrator of the diocese, and his name is found in a list of candidates proposed for the Bishopric. Over and above his life-long study of astronomy and mathematics, he both studied and practised medicine, and made it a rule for himself to place his services as a physician freely at the disposal of the poor. Another rule was to allow no other occupation to interfere with his clerical duties. He was known as a most devout child of the Church, having a special devotion to the Blessed Virgin, in whose honour he composed several poems. Like the rest of his family, he was also a Dominican Tertiary.

Such was the man who patiently and laboriously thought out the system which, however plain and obvious the common consent of mankind makes it appear to us, was in his day opposed not only to a public opinion no less unanimous, but seemingly to common sense and ocular demonstration. His great work, "On the Revolutions of the Orbs of Heaven" (*De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*), commenced in 1507, was not published till the very close of its author's life in 1543, and perhaps, but for the importunity of others, would not have been published at all. Copernicus, as he himself tells us, shrank from the storm of obloquy which he was sure to arouse by contradicting "the received opinion of the mathematicians, and almost contradicting common sense," in supposing the earth to move. Foremost amongst those who urged publication was an eminent Churchman, Cardinal Schömberg, who insisted upon the scientific value of this novel theory. When he resolved to comply with these solicitations, Copernicus dedicated his work to Pope Paul III., in a Preface detailing the objections which he anticipated. These he apprehended would be from the "mathematicians,"—or philosophers,—as indicated above, but he sustained himself with the reflection that each of these had his own theory of the heavens which differed from all the rest. As for ignoramuses who might strive to raise objections from

¹ Copernicus, b. 1473, d. 1543; Galileo, b. 1564, d. 1642.

Scriptural expressions which they misinterpreted, of these he made no account ;¹ which is his only allusion to the theological aspect of the question.

The book having appeared, the only voices raised on theological grounds against its novelties were those of Protestants. Luther denounced Copernicus as an arrogant fool who wrote in defiance of Scripture. Melanchthon declared that such mischievous doctrines should be suppressed by the secular power. Other chiefs of the same party spoke in the same sense.² Osiander, being commissioned to superintend a new edition, foisted on the work a Preface quite foreign to the author's intentions, and explaining his conclusions away.

Catholic Churchmen—on the other hand—received the book with much favour. As has been said, its publication was due chiefly to the exhortations of Cardinal Schömberg, as well as the Bishop of Culm, while the Bishop of Ermeland afterwards set up a monument to its author. Pope Paul III. accepted the dedication ; and neither he nor any of the twelve Pontiffs who followed him raised any question concerning its teaching : nor did any of the Roman Congregations ; whilst "lectures in support of the heliocentric doctrine were delivered in the ecclesiastical colleges."³ For more than seventy years the *De Revolutionibus* encountered no sort of opposition in these quarters : not till* Galileo forced the Scriptural question upon notice were any modifications of its language insisted on,—and these, as will be seen, were trivial, and of little practical importance.⁴

¹ "Si fortasse erunt μετανοίοις, qui cum omnium mathematum ignari sint, tamen de illis iudicium sibi sumunt, propter aliquem locum Scripturae, male ad suum propositum detortum . . . illos non moror."

² Luther, *Tischreden* (Edit. 1743), p. 2266. Melanchthon, *Init. doct. physic.* (Edit. Butschneider), vol. xiii. p. 217.

³ Whewell, *History of Inductive Sciences*, i. 418. (Edit. 1847.)

⁴ Professor Draper writes (*Conflict between Religion and Science*, p. 167) :

"Copernicus, a Prussian, about the year 1507, had completed a book 'On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Bodies.' . . . Aware that his doctrines were totally opposed to revealed truth, and foreseeing that they would bring upon him the punishments of the Church, he expressed himself in a cautious and apologetic manner, saying that he had only taken the liberty of trying whether, on the supposition of the earth's motion, it was possible to find better explanations than the ancient ones of the revolution of the celestial orbs ; and that in doing this he had only taken the privilege that had been allowed to others, of feigning what hypothesis they chose. The Preface was addressed to Pope Paul III. Full of misgivings as to what might be the result, he refrained from publishing his book for thirty-six years. . . . Its fate was such as he had anticipated. The Inquisition condemned it as heretical, etc."

From the facts as given in the text, the reader can form his own opinion as to the honesty of such an account of things.

It must not be forgotten that, beyond its greater simplicity and beauty, Copernicus could adduce no proof whatever to sustain his theory, for, the telescope not being yet discovered, he had not even the insufficient arguments employed by Galileo. It is even a matter of some uncertainty, as Professor De Morgan declares,¹ whether Copernicus was really a Copernican, that is to say, whether he believed that his system was true in fact, and did not rather present it as one which, explaining all the phenomena of the heavens in less complex fashion than others, might conveniently be employed in astronomical calculations.

Such was the situation when Galileo came on the scene. Beginning life as a convinced follower of the traditional astronomy of Ptolemy, he was by the year 1597 an enthusiastic Copernican. In 1609, he invented, or rather perfected, the telescope, with which he speedily made discoveries which did much to establish the truth of the newer system. The chief of these were the satellites of the planet Jupiter, revolving round their primary, the phases of Venus and Mercury, the supposed want of which had been one of the strongest arguments urged against Copernicanism, and the spots of the sun, which shed so much light on the motion and constitution of that luminary.

These were Galileo's most important contributions to astronomy, and had the enlargement of scientific knowledge been the bugbear of ecclesiasticism, they should at once have drawn down upon him a storm of persecution. But, far from this, they at once made him a public character, and obtained for him triumphal honours throughout Italy, and very specially at Rome. Visiting the Eternal City in 1611,—as Sir David Brewster tells us²

He was received with that distinction which was due to his great talents and his extended reputation. Princes, Cardinals, and Prelates hastened to do him honour; and even those who discredited his discoveries, and dreaded their results, vied with the true friends of science in their anxiety to see the intellectual wonder of the age.

So great was the desire for instruction and information that, setting up his telescope in the Quirinal garden, belonging to Cardinal Bandini, he exhibited his discoveries to eager and admiring crowds.

¹ *Companion to the British Almanack*, 1855.

² *Martyrs of Science*, p. 44.

Not till four years later—1615—was this peaceful condition disturbed, and whilst we cannot but deplore the totally wrong course adopted by his opponents, it is undeniable that the blame must largely rest with Galileo himself. Had he been content to confine himself to his own province of science, he might undoubtedly have gone on undisturbed with his observations and discoveries, but he was a fierce controversialist, and insisted on attacking those who would not accept his teachings in a style which naturally excited their hostility.¹

Nor was this all; he tried his hand on the interpretation of Scripture, in regard of which—as Whewell observes—the Reformation controversy had, since the days of Copernicus, made the Church authorities highly suspicious, and his attempt to produce Scriptural confirmation for the earth's motion, which to the multitude seemed an incredible paradox, and even to the scientific few a daring though beautiful innovation, was not calculated to allay suspicion. It is no doubt true, as he urged, along with his friend the Carmelite Foscarini, that the inspired writings are intended to teach only the truths necessary for salvation, not those which we are capable of discovering by the exercise of our natural powers, but this, which would now be admitted as a truism by the most orthodox, was then a totally new idea, calculated to shock the public mind. It is also undeniable that those who judged Galileo were firmly persuaded, however erroneously, that the system which he championed was entirely false, and therefore not science at all. In any case, they certainly held it for a far greater evil that men should have their faith in the Bible shaken, than that they should not know whether the earth went round the sun or the sun round the earth. It is clear, moreover, that Galileo was encouraged by the sceptical party—by no means a small one—which wished to discredit religion altogether, and that what his adversaries chiefly laboured to prevent was the dissemination of his doctrines amongst the masses, who having no scientific training would be sure to misunderstand and exaggerate their import.²

¹ "The boldness—may we not say the recklessness—with which Galileo insisted upon making proselytes of his enemies, served but to alienate them from the truth. . . . The Church party, particularly its highest dignitaries, were certainly disposed to rest on the defensive. Flanked on one side by the logic of the schools, and on the other by the popular interpretation of Scripture, and backed by the strong arm of the civil power, they were not disposed to interfere with the prosecution of science, however much they may have dreaded its influence." (Sir D. Brewster, *op. cit.* p. 58.)

² See, for instance, the letter of Remus to Kepler, *infra*.

This being so, what the authorities objected to was Galileo's dogmatic insistence on the absolute truth of his own view, especially as he had no sufficient proof to demonstrate it. Therefore, as Dr. Whewell sums up the matter,¹

He was accused before the Inquisition in 1615, but at that period the result was that he was merely recommended to confine himself to the mathematical reasonings upon this system, and to abstain from meddling with Scripture.

Unfortunately, his judges further insisted that Galileo should formally repudiate the doctrine of the earth's motion as untrue, and should promise on oath never again to defend or advocate it, which he did in ample terms; that this was not, however, considered as absolute and final by the Court itself is clear from a declaration made by its most influential member, Cardinal Bellarmine. Writing to Galileo's ally, Foscarini, Bellarmine urges² that they should both be satisfied with showing that the Copernican theory explains all celestial phenomena, an unexceptionable proposition (*benissimo detto*), and one sufficient for the practical purposes of the mathematicians. But let them not declare that their system is actually true in fact, which appears to contradict Scripture. He then continues:

I say that if a real proof be found that the sun is fixed in the centre of the world, and the earth in the third heaven,³ and that the sun does not revolve round the earth, but the earth round the sun, then it will be necessary to proceed, very circumspectly, to explain the Scriptures.

That Galileo had in fact no "real proof" of the doctrine which he so loudly proclaimed, is now universally admitted,⁴ and was acknowledged by Galileo himself, who, writing to Bellarmine, could only plead that his system satisfied the phenomena, which was equally true of the old Ptolemaic

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 419.

² See his letter in full, *apud Grisar, Galileistudien*, p. 367.

³ *I.e.*, is the third in order of the planets.

⁴ "By investing Copernicus with a system which requires Galileo, Kepler, and Newton to explain it, and their pupils to understand it, the modern astronomer refers the want of immediate acceptance of the system to ignorance, prejudice, and over adherence to antiquity. No doubt all these things can be traced: but the ignorance was of a kind which belonged equally to the partisans and to the opponents, and which fairly imposed on the propounder of the system the onus of meeting arguments, which, in the period we speak of, he did not and could not meet." (Professor De Morgan, *Companion to the British Almanack*, 1855, p. 21.)

astronomy, though with more cumbrous machinery.¹ How far less plain was the matter then than we now are naturally inclined to suppose, may be judged from the evidence of Professor Huxley, who wrote to Professor Mivart, Nov. 12, 1885 :

I gave some attention to the case of Galileo when I was in Italy; and I arrived at the conclusion that the Pope and the College of Cardinals had rather the best of it.²

Neither must it be forgotten that Copernicanism was rejected not only by Popes and Cardinals, but by men of science whose names were then most in repute, and whom we still regard with reverence. To name but a few : Clavius, the reformer of the Calendar, and Tycho Brahe, the great Danish astronomer and Kepler's master, would have none of it : Lord Bacon pronounced it "most certainly false."³ Descartes, who outlived Galileo, while accepting it as a perfect theory, would not admit it as actually true, for want of proof.

Nor is this all. It helps us to realize the confusion which reigned in men's minds, to find that Galileo himself and other leaders of his party, in many instances adopted theories which were quite unscientific, and rejected others which are now reckoned amongst the greatest of scientific discoveries. Galileo

¹ Whewell, after observing that if the Copernican system had the advantage of *simplicity*, the Ptolemaic had that of *obviousness*, thus continues (*op. cit.* part v. c. 1) :

"Nor when we speak of the superior simplicity of the Copernican theory, must we forget, that though this theory has undoubtedly, in this respect, a great advantage over the Ptolemaic, yet that the Copernican system itself is very complex, when it undertakes to account, as the Ptolemaic did for the *inequalities* of the motions of the sun, moon, and planets; and that, in the hands of Copernicus, it retained a large share of the eccentrics and epicycles of its predecessor, and, in some parts, with increased machinery. The heliocentric theory, without these appendages, would not approach the Ptolemaic in the accurate explanation of facts. . . . After the promulgation of the theory of eccentrics and epicycles on the geocentric hypothesis, there was no *published* heliocentric theory which could bear comparison with that hypothesis."

² *Life and Letters*, ii. 424.

³ Bacon writes (*Descriptio Globi intellectualis*): "In the system of Copernicus there are many and grave difficulties." [Some of the author's assumptions] "are proceedings which mark a man who thinks nothing of introducing fictions of any kind into nature, provided his calculations turn out well."

Bacon (says Whewell) wished for a system that could be supported by sound physical considerations, "and it must be allowed that, at the period of which we are speaking, this had not been done in favour of the Copernican hypothesis."

Milton, who paid a visit to Galileo at Florence, appears never to have been a convinced Copernican. There are passages in the *Paradise Lost* which seem to favour both systems.

maintained that the phenomena of the tides were evidence of the rotation of the earth,—which we know to be quite wrong. He lent his name to a totally untenable theory regarding comets, already disproved by Tycho, and wrote in its support.¹ The objection against the heliocentric system, founded on the supposed absence of phases in the inferior planets, was met by Copernicus with the supposition that Mercury and Venus are transparent and the sun's rays pass through them. Such an explanation was evidently unscientific, nevertheless, Galileo praises Copernicus for thus sticking to his guns, though, as Whewell says, this was a real and grave difficulty requiring a scientific answer. What is still more important, Galileo refused to accept the laws discovered by Kepler, a much greater astronomer than himself, these laws ranking second only to those of Newton in the history of astronomy.

Kepler in his turn was never wholly weaned from belief in astrology. Copernicus, over and above his groundless assumption of planetary transparency, in order to get over a difficulty, encumbered his system by attributing to the earth, besides rotation and revolution, a third motion, that "of declination," in order to explain how it is that its axis points always to the celestial pole.

The condemnation of Galileo was accompanied by that of the *De Revolutionibus* of Copernicus, which, however, was not absolute, but only "donec corrigatur," that is to say, until certain specified changes were made. These changes, not a dozen in number, were merely verbal and trivial, the object of all being to show that the heliocentric system was proposed as an hypothesis, not as an established fact.

In the same condemnation was included the *Epitome* of Kepler, a treatise advocating Copernicanism. Thereupon its author, though not a Catholic, took alarm, and wrote to an Italian friend, Remus, to ask what this meant. Would the condemnation extend to Austria, and the sale of his book be there prohibited? Should he himself visit Italy, would he be in danger of imprisonment, or of having to forswear his scientific beliefs?

His friend replied :²

This book is only prohibited as contrary to the decree pronounced by the holy office two years ago. This has been partly caused by

¹ In his *Saggiatore*. The theory maintained that comets are mere atmospheric emanations reflecting sunlight after the evanescent fashion of a halo or rainbow. See *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (9th Edit.), article "Galileo," by Miss A. M. Clerke.

² See Drinkwater's *Life of Kepler*, p. 48.

a Neapolitan monk [Foscarini] who was spreading these notions by publishing them in Italian, whence were arising dangerous consequences and opinions ; and besides, Galileo was pleading his cause at Rome with too much violence. Copernicus has been corrected in the same manner, for some lines, at least, in the beginning of his first book. But, by obtaining a permission, it may be read (and, as I suppose, this "Epitome" also) by the learned and skilful in this science, both at Rome and throughout all Italy. There is therefore no ground for your alarm, either in Italy or Austria : only keep yourself within bounds and put a guard on your own passions.

Galileo's subsequent behaviour, if it does not justify, undoubtedly went far to provoke his second prosecution, in 1632. Having solemnly vowed not to promulgate the Copernican theory as anything but a theory, he proceeded straightway, not only to break his word, but to import into the question fresh bitterness and rancour.¹ Nevertheless, when in 1624, he again visited Rome, he met with what Brewster styles "a noble and generous reception," from Pope Urban VIII., who as Cardinal Barberini had been his warm friend, and had opposed his former condemnation. Besides other marks of honour, Urban now conferred upon him a pension, to which as a foreigner he could have no claim.² He would not, however, as Galileo had expected, annul the former judgment of the Inquisition.

On his return to Florence, Galileo set himself to complete his famous but ill-starred dialogue on the two great systems of astronomy, in which the defender of Ptolemaism is utterly routed and put to shame by the advocates of Copernicanism. This was published in 1632, and being plainly in contravention

¹ "Though Galileo had made a narrow escape from the grasp of the Inquisition, yet he was never sufficiently sensible of the lenity which he experienced. When he left Rome in 1616, under the solemn pledge of never again teaching the obnoxious doctrine, it was with a hostility against the Church, suppressed but deeply cherished ; and his resolution to propagate the heresy seems to have been coeval with the vow by which he renounced it. In 1618 . . . he alludes in the most sarcastic manner to the conduct of the Church. The same hostile tone, more or less, pervaded all his writings, and, while he laboured to sharpen the edge of his satire, he endeavoured to guard himself against its effects, by an affectation of the humblest deference to the decisions of theology. . . . He was spurred on by the violence of a party." (Sir D. Brewster, *op. cit.* p. 77.)

² "Galileo was a foreigner at Rome. The sovereign of the Papal State owed him no obligation, and hence we must regard the pension as a donation from the Roman Pontiff to science itself, and as a declaration to the Christian world that religion was not jealous of philosophy, and that the Church of Rome was willing to respect and foster even the genius of its enemies." (Brewster, *op. cit.* p. 79.)

of his previous solemn engagement, was taken by the Roman authorities as a direct challenge, and in consequence he was once more cited to appear before the Inquisition. Although he disavowed his supposed opinions, and maintained that since 1616 he had never held the Copernican theory, he was condemned, as "vehemently suspected of heresy," to incarceration at the pleasure of the tribunal, and was enjoined by way of penance to recite once a week for three years the seven Penitential Psalms.¹

The prosecution of Galileo, and the assumption by an ecclesiastical tribunal of authority to decide a question of physical science, was undoubtedly, as has been acknowledged, a grievous and deplorable mistake, which no one will now attempt to defend. But what we have to inquire is how far the action of those who condemned Galileo can be held to support the charge of inveterate hostility to science brought against the Church. On this question, after what has already been said, it will be sufficient to quote the observations of Dr. Whewell. Having freely expressed his mind as to the prosecution, he thus continues :²

I would not, however, be understood to assert the condemnation of new doctrines in science to be either a general or a characteristic practice of the Romish Church. Certainly the intelligent and cultivated minds of Italy, and many of the most eminent of her ecclesiastics among them, have been the foremost in promoting and welcoming the progress of science ; and, as I have stated, there were found among the Italian ecclesiastics of Galileo's time many of the earliest and most enlightened adherents of the Copernican system. The condemnation of the doctrine of the earth's motion, is, so far as I am aware, the only instance in which the Papal authority has pronounced a decree upon a point of science. And the most candid of the adherents of the Romish Church condemn the assumption of authority in such matters, which in this one instance, at least, was made by the ecclesiastical tribunals.

¹ As to Galileo's actual treatment, *vid. infra*. As to a famous traditional episode of his trial the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says :

"The legend according to which Galileo, on rising from his knees after repeating the form of abjuration, stamped on the ground, and exclaimed, 'E pur si muove !' is, as may readily be supposed, entirely apocryphal. The earliest ascertained authority for it is the seventh edition of an *Historical Dictionary*, published at Caen in 1789."

More recently, a somewhat earlier record of it has been found in the *Querelles Littéraires* of the Abbé Iraillh, published at Paris in 1761. No authority is given beyond "assure-t-on."

² *Op. cit.* p. 462.

Dr. Whewell's judgment is fully borne out by the facts of the case. Galileo himself was no wise checked in his pursuit of science, and even in the province of astronomy could pursue his researches to his heart's content, provided only that he refrained from proposing Copernicanism as an established fact. It is even pleaded that science was the gainer by his forced withdrawal from polemics, which enabled him to devote his great powers to more profitable labours.¹ However this may be, he remained busy with his telescope, and in 1637—just before he was stricken blind—he discovered the diurnal libration of the moon.

But although he is popularly known as an astronomer only, it was not in this branch of science that his most substantial work was done. The direct services which he rendered to astronomy are virtually summed up in his telescopic discoveries,² and he did not, like his great contemporary Kepler, reveal new laws. But in the province of physics he has left enduring monuments. With him the science of motion may be said to have begun. Happily combining experiment with calculation, he discovered the laws of falling bodies. He studied the properties of the cycloid, and attempted the problem of its quadrature. In statics he gave the first direct and satisfactory demonstration of the laws of equilibrium and the principle of virtual velocities. He discovered the isochronism of the pendulum. In none of these discoveries did he meet with anything on the part of ecclesiastics or any others but encouragement and applause.³

Neither was he debarred from communication and correspondence with other scientific men, amongst whom may be mentioned Toricelli, Cavalieri, Michelini, Sotterini, Dino Peri, Ambrogio della Concezione, and Vincenzio Renieri, the last two being members of Religious Orders.

And meanwhile scientific research was pursued with ardour throughout Italy. Magallotti made valuable observations of comets, and Padre Plati of solar eclipses. Honoratus Fabri

¹ Grisar, *op. cit.* p. 338.

² *Encyclopaedia Britannica, ut sup.*

³ At Pisa, early in his career, by experiments made from the leaning tower, he demonstrated to his fellow-professors and students of the University the falsity of the doctrine that bodies fall with velocities proportional to their weight, and consequently that of elemental weight and levity. Complicated by a quarrel with the Medici family, this upsetting of old beliefs made him unpopular, and induced him to leave Pisa; but there is no ground whatever for the statement sometimes made, that the Church had anything to do with the matter.

and Gottignies advanced mathematical studies. At Rome itself, Cassini discovered the moons of Saturn, and the Jesuit Kircher, being summoned to Rome within two years of Galileo's trial, through the influence of Cardinal Barberini, there devoted himself for many years to the study of light, magnetism, and other branches of science, besides forming a museum, the "Kircherianum," at that time the best scientific collection in existence. At the same time the telescopes manufactured in the same city by Campani and Dici obtained a world-wide reputation, and were everywhere in request. Various scientific societies and academies also flourished—unmolested.

From such facts we can form an opinion as to how truly the one instance quoted to prove the hostility of the Church to science, can be said to have been animated by an anti-scientific spirit.

Although the treatment actually endured by Galileo at the hands of the Inquisition does not directly affect the subject of our inquiry, it seems advisable, in view of the statements commonly made and believed in its regard, to say something concerning it.

Professor Draper, for example, writes thus:¹

He [Galileo] was then committed to prison, treated with remorseless severity during the remaining ten years of his life, and was denied burial in consecrated ground.

It will be sufficient to compare with such statements the account given by the eminent authorities whose testimony we have so frequently cited.

Professor De Morgan writes:²

We heartily wish that all persecutions, Catholic and Protestant, had been as honest and as mild. There is no reason to doubt the perfect good faith of the whole proceeding, and remembering that the tribunal was one of which Galileo himself admitted the jurisdiction, and supposing the inquisitors to have believed they were doing their duty, any less amount of severity would have been a palpable respect of persons, for Galileo had powerful friends.

Sir David Brewster:³

During the whole of the trial, Galileo was treated with the most marked indulgence. Abhorring, as we must do, the principles and practice of this odious tribunal [the Inquisition], and reprobating its

¹ *Conflict between Religion and Science*, p. 132.

² *English Cyclopaedia*, "Motion of the Earth."

³ *Martyrs of Science*, p. 88.

interference with the cautious deductions of science, we must yet admit that, on this occasion, its deliberations were not dictated by passion, nor its power directed by vengeance. Though placed at their judgment-seat as a heretic, Galileo stood there with the recognized attributes of a sage; and though an offender against the laws of which they were the guardian, yet the highest respect was yielded to his genius, and the kindest consideration to his infirmities.

Dr. Whewell :¹

The prosecutors of Galileo are still held up to the scorn and aversion of mankind: although, as we have seen, they did not act till it seemed that their position compelled them to do so, and then proceeded with all the gentleness and moderation which were compatible with judicial forms.

It must also be noted that when Galileo's "imprisonment" is spoken of, the term must be understood in a sense quite different from the ordinary. As Grisar does not hesitate to declare :²

During the whole course of his life, Galileo spent not one single hour in a prison properly so called.

The "prisons" provided for him were lodgings, always comfortable, and generally luxurious, in the houses or palaces of his friends and patrons.

Finally, he was buried, not only in consecrated ground, but within the Church of Santa Croce, in Florence.³

As to the alleged torture of Galileo, Dr. Whewell writes :⁴

It has sometimes been asserted or insinuated that Galileo was subjected to bodily torture. An argument has been drawn from the expressions used in his sentence. . . . It has been argued . . . that *rigorosum examen* necessarily implies bodily torture, notwithstanding that no such thing is mentioned by Galileo and his contemporaries, and notwithstanding the consideration with which he was treated in all other respects: but M. Biot more justly remarks (*Biog. Univ.* article "Galileo") that such a procedure is incredible.

J. G.

¹ *History of the Inductive Sciences*, pp. 425, 426.

² *Galileistudien*, p. 77.

³ Brewster, *op. cit.* p. 113.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 465.

A Royal Recluse.

I.

IN the *salles des Nattier*, on the ground floor of the Palace of Versailles, hangs the portrait of a girl princess, slight and soft-featured, with big brown eyes. Her dress, surroundings, and attitude suggest the dainty elegance of the eighteenth century ; one hand holds a carnation, and the eyes look out upon the world with the wistful frankness of an innocent child.

This smiling personality seems so far removed from the hardships of a cloistered life that it is difficult to recognize in "Madame Louise de France," a future Carmelite, and to believe that the silken robes were exchanged for the rough serge habit, that the abundant hair was closely cropped, and the laughing eyes, accustomed to the splendid horizon of courtly Versailles, opened during seventeen years only on the narrow precincts of a poor suburban convent.

The exchange was made by Madame Louise when in the prime of womanhood, consequently it was a free, deliberate act, carried out in all its details with a quiet energy and a practical common sense that are eminently characteristic.

What the Court and the world were pleased to call a sublime sacrifice brought the donor unmixed happiness even in this life : the merriest nun in the kingdom was doubtless the royal lady, who laughingly remarked that the rough serge habit weighed less heavily on her shoulders than the elaborate robes of stiff brocade, of which the portrait gallery at Versailles gives us so many samples.

Her renunciation appeared to her contemporaries all the more striking from the contrast between the life that she gave up and that which she embraced. In mediæval times, vocations like hers were of frequent occurrence ; numbers of women of princely or royal birth exchanged a Court for a cloister, without exciting the wonder of their friends. In the sceptical and pleasure-loving eighteenth century, a different spirit reigned

among the upper classes ; these might have approved that a king's daughter should become the abbess of some royal monastery, where a certain amount of religious practice was gracefully combined with much pomp and splendour, but Madame Louise's absolute renunciation was too thorough to be easily understood.

Hence, the sensation that was, not unnaturally, created by a vocation so unexpected ; hence also the interest that after more than one hundred and thirty years is attached to the story of the royal recluse.

Louise Marie was the tenth and youngest daughter of Louis XV. and his Queen, Marie Leckzinska. She was born at Versailles on July 15, 1737, and, except to her mother, her advent into this world gave little pleasure. The birth of a Dauphin in 1739 made the direct succession to the throne apparently safe, and was a cause of universal rejoicing, whereas the births of eight princesses, two of whom died young, were considered as an extra and irksome call upon the impoverished finances of the kingdom.

According to the traditions of the Court, each little princess was provided with a separate household ; the baby Louise, for instance, had fifteen servants attached to her small person from the moment of her birth, and the households of her elder sisters were further increased by a number of governesses and ladies in waiting. This complicated and expensive arrangement was particularly objectionable at a moment when the public exchequer was well-nigh empty, and the prime minister, Cardinal Fleury, determined upon a bold stroke of economy. He persuaded the King to break up the households of his youngest daughters and to send the four princesses, with a limited number of attendants, to the royal Abbey of Fontevrault, to be educated with no more pomp than the children of noblemen.

This unprecedented step excited much criticism, but the Cardinal held to his point ; the Queen, after shedding a few unavailing tears, gave her consent, and on June 16, 1738, the four children, Victoire, Sophie, Thérèse-Félicité, and Louise, aged respectively five, four, two, and one year, departed for Fontevrault, near Saumur.

The journey lasted thirteen days, and summer was at its height when the little girls reached the noble abbey that lay in the fair and fertile province of Anjou.

It was founded in the thirteenth century by Robert d'Arbrissel, who established two convents, one for men, one for women, with the curious stipulation that the Abbess should govern the monks as well as the nuns.

The holder of this responsible position was, as a matter of course, a woman of princely, or at any rate noble birth, and, if possible, of superior attainments. When the King's daughters were sent to Fontevrault, the Abbess was Louise Françoise de Rochechouart de Vivonne, who, clad in the white habit of her order, welcomed her little guests at the gates of the monastery.

The pride of Fontevrault were its cloisters, where some of the Plantagenet Kings of England, their Queens, and their children slept their last sleep, but the lodgings allotted to *Mesdames de France* lay beyond, close to a terrace overshadowed by chestnut trees. Here, in the *logis Bourbon*, the children spent some happy years, saddened only by the death in 1744 of Madame Thérèse-Félicité, our little heroine's favourite playmate.

Madame Louise was a quick-tempered, generous, and truthful child ; her natural haughtiness seems to have been gently, but firmly repressed by her chief governess, Madame de Soulages, a Religious whose mental and moral capabilities fitted her for the delicate task of training a king's daughter. The atmosphere of Fontevrault was in all respects healthier than that of Versailles, and though the princesses were surrounded by every care, there seems to have been no fulsome flattery or servile submission among those who served them. Once, petulant and high-spirited Madame Louise, indignant at her maid refusing to obey her, exclaimed : "Am I not the daughter of your King ?" "And I, Madame," was the prompt reply, "am I not the daughter of your God ?"

The child was by nature straightforward and sincere, willing to acknowledge her failings ; after another outburst of pride and self-will she begged her maid's pardon : "You are right ; do forgive me."

Madame de Soulages, while she checked her pupil's faults and developed her nobler instincts, did not neglect to give her the amount of instruction appropriate to her social condition. It has been said that the education bestowed on the daughters of Louis XV. at Fontevrault was so imperfect that Madame Louise at the age of twelve did not know how to read ! The letters written by the little princess sufficiently disprove this

assertion ; neither she nor her sisters were learned women, but well informed and well educated. "You know," writes Madame Louise at the age of thirteen, "that I am not lazy. Thank God, that is my least fault," and she seems to have willingly responded to her governess's tuition.

In 1748, at the age of fifteen, Madame Victoire, the eldest of the quartette, was recalled to Versailles, and two years later, in October, 1750, her younger sisters in their turn left Fontevrault, after spending twelve peaceful years in the solemn precincts of the royal abbey.

The journey homewards in the autumn must have been full of interest to the convent-bred princesses ; through the "Garden of France" the slow procession of coaches wended its way : a bevy of ladies of illustrious birth had been sent from Versailles to escort *Mesdames*, and the villagers, amused and interested by the gorgeous aspect of the *cortège*, enthusiastically cheered as it passed.

Along the valley of the Loire, the princesses travelled within sight of the stately Renaissance *châteaux*, around which are gathered so many tragic and splendid memories : Chaumont, Chambord, Amboise, Blois ; at Cléry, near Orléans, they stopped to pay their respects to the time-honoured statue of our Lady ; finally, at Bourron, in the forest of Fontainebleau, they found waiting for them under a gold canopy of yellow and russet leaves, the King, the Dauphin, and their sister Victoire.

The Court where Madame Louise now took her place, and where she was to live for twenty years, presented an appearance of refinement and splendour, beneath which were concealed grave abuses. In spite of his open neglect of his Queen, Louis XV. still retained a hold upon the affection of his people, who, a few years before, had bestowed upon the handsome young sovereign the most ill-deserved surname of *le bien aimé*. Matters assumed a different aspect at a later period, when a series of reverses and the disgraceful squandering of public finances enlightened the nation as to its ruler's real worth ; the King's popularity then rapidly declined, and his surname of the "well-beloved" became a bitter irony.

Madame Louise, when she left Fontevrault, was only a girl of thirteen, and, in consequence, better able to appreciate the external brilliancy and charm of her new life than to penetrate its underlying evils.

The Queen, resigned to her fate, led a colourless, somewhat

solitary existence ; she found her best comfort in practices of devotion and charity, and her chief pleasure in the society of a few chosen friends. These men and women were wanting neither in culture nor intelligence, and professed for their royal mistress a devotedness that her kindness of heart and dignified patience well deserved.

Her daughters, whose lives, although fenced in by the hard and fast rules of Court etiquette, were in a certain measure mingled with her own, remained unmarried, except the eldest, who, in 1739, became the wife of Philip, Infant of Spain and Duke of Parma. *Madame Infante*, whose coarse features and florid colouring even Nattier's courtly brush failed to beautify, seems never to have taken root in her tiny Italian duchy. She returned to Versailles on long visits, and died there of small-pox in 1759.

Of her five unmarried sisters Madame Henriette was gentle, serious-minded, deeply religious ; Madame Adelaide, handsome and clever, but domineering and ambitious ; Madame Victoire, fair and graceful, kind-hearted and easy going ; Madame Sophie, plain and shy. The very distinct personality of Madame Louise, the youngest of the sisterhood, stands out with peculiar vividness ; she seems to have combined Henriette's piety, Victoire's kind-heartedness, and Adelaide's love of outdoor sports and amusements. Her gay, good humour carried her safely over the shoals and pitfalls that lay under the dazzling surface of Court life, and prevented the unhealthy and uncongenial atmosphere from tainting her soul or narrowing her mind.

She was not handsome, scarcely pretty, but "nothing can be pleasanter than *la petite*," wrote her mother, to whom her daughter's portrait gave unfeigned pleasure when, in 1747, Louis XV. sent Nattier to Fontevrault to paint the little princesses as a surprise for the Queen. As a girl and a woman, Madame Louise kept the promise of her childhood. She had a bad figure, an expressive, pleasant, intelligent countenance, full of life and eagerness. She was clever and courageous ; having nothing about her of Madame Sophie's shyness, she willingly acted as spokeswoman on behalf of her sisters when the occasion required it. As became a daughter of the Bourbons, in whom love of sport was an inherited taste, she loved hunting, and was a bold and skilful horsewoman. On one occasion when hunting in the forest of Compiègne she was thrown from her horse, but to the admiration and dismay of her attendants she insisted on remounting immediately, and rode back to the *château*.

She was neither sentimental nor imaginative, simply a bright, healthy-minded, active, and energetic girl, who took part with the simplicity and eagerness of youth in the pleasures that life at Versailles naturally presented to a convent-bred princess. But her enjoyment in her surroundings never interfered with the devotional practices that, when once adopted, formed part of her every-day life, and were never, under any pretence, sacrificed to more mundane occupations. "I not only love my daughter Louise, I respect her," often said the Queen, who delighted in this happy combination of natural enjoyment with deep-seated piety.

The wearisome rules of Court etiquette, that in after-years were to weigh more heavily on her shoulders, sat lightly on Madame Louise in the first flush of her youth, before experience had taught her its stern lessons and death had narrowed her family circle. Within the gorgeous precincts of the Court, the Queen and her children formed a small coterie which, during some years, was not devoid of brightness. Marie Leckzinska's gentle and passive resignation kept at bay the rebellious feelings that their mother's grievances might have suggested to her children. The princesses were young, and so far the artificial atmosphere of Versailles had not quenched their spirits or distorted their minds. To this circle belonged the Dauphin and his wife, a Saxon princess, whose sound good sense and sterling worth harmonized with her husband's views and principles. Louis XV., an indulgent parent when his daughters were concerned, was ill at ease with his heir, whose character and conduct seemed a perpetual reproach, and whom he carefully excluded from any share of political influence. Thrown on his own resources, the Dauphin turned his attention to military matters, on which he was an authority, and to the careful training of his four sons, three of whom were eventually to wear the crown.¹ Unfortunately for these royal boys, neither the Dauphin nor his wife lived to complete a task for which both were pre-eminently fitted.

Thus passed the first few years of our heroine's Court life; like all noble souls, she only gave the true measure of her worth when touched by misfortune's hand; as long as her happy family circle remained unbroken she seemed to experience no craving for a fuller, more perfect life; it needed the voids

¹ Louis XVI., Louis XVIII., and Charles X.

created by death to make her realize the weary emptiness of her splendid surroundings. After this weariness came a keen realization of her father's errors and, as a consequence, an ardent wish to expiate them ; but this feeling, the keynote of her religious vocation, only developed later. Seldom indeed was a vocation more carefully studied, more deliberately fostered and prepared than hers, but when, after years of thought her resolve was made, seldom was a decision so important carried out with such matter-of-fact simplicity.

The first break in Madame Louise's home circle was caused by the death of her sister Henriette, in 1752 : "To me she was a beautiful example, she lived like a saint." Such was the testimony rendered by the future Carmelite to the young princess, who at the early age of twenty-four seems to have attained a rare degree of perfection. Then, in 1759, died *Madame Infante*, less saintly, but endeared to her sisters by ties of blood and of close companionship. After her, the Dauphin's eldest son, the little Duke of Burgundy, was carried off by a disease that in these modern days might probably have been arrested by skilful surgery. A portrait in the *salles des Nattier* of this sturdy little prince, whose premature death was looked upon as a national calamity, pictures a fair-haired, blue-eyed child, bearing a strong likeness to his Saxon mother. He was unusually gifted, and had, says the memoirs of the time, "a royal soul ;" haughty and overbearing, but singularly generous and brave. It is a curious symptom of the habits of thought of the contradictory and puzzling eighteenth century that the boy's death was spoken of before him as though he had been a grown man instead of a mere child. He was kept informed of the progress of his disease, exhorted to make the sacrifice of his life ; even his devoted tutor, Mgr. du Coetlosquet, addressed to him as he lay dying a sermon on the text, "My kingdom is not of this world" !

One wonders whether, had this energetic and intelligent child lived to wear the crown instead of his younger brother, Louis XVI., the destinies of France might have been modified ! It is at any rate certain that the death of the Dauphin, who, in 1765, followed his eldest son to the grave, hastened the progress of the Revolution, that a quarter of a century later was to sweep away the ancient French monarchy. The Dauphiness, Maria Josepha of Saxony, was the next taken ; she died in 1767, at the early age of thirty-five, leaving five little children, to whom

her wise tenderness and enlightened care were of untold value in the midst of that corrupt and careless Court.

Marie Leckzinska's heart was broken by the loss of her only son, the pride and comfort of her shadowed life; when she lay dangerously ill and the physicians surrounded her with suggestions of new remedies, "If you wish to cure me," said the dying Queen, "give me back my son."

This last blow, that fell upon her in 1768, broke up the happy circle in the midst of which Madame Louise was led to forget the artificial atmosphere so contrary to her frank and joyous nature.

About the same time other influences contributed to ripen and develop the graver tendencies of her mind. In after-years, when reviewing the different stages through which her religious vocation had passed, she alluded to a ceremony that took place in 1751 as the starting point of her call to the Carmelite Order.

The heroine of the ceremony was a woman, young, beautiful and wealthy, the Comtesse de Rupelmonde, who, having lost her husband and her only child, entered the Carmelite convent of the Rue de Grenelle, in Paris. The Queen, to whose person Madame de Rupelmonde had been attached as lady in waiting, was present on the occasion, accompanied by her youngest daughter. The sight of the new Religious, a woman who, barely thirty years of age, smilingly put aside all the good things of this world, seemed to fascinate Madame Louise. She asked to visit the monastery, and so evident was the interest that she took in all the details of the nun's life that the Prioress laughingly observed: "One might almost believe that Madame means to become a daughter of St. Teresa." "Why not," was the reply, "if the daughters of St. Teresa are so happy."

This vivid impression was deepened and strengthened by the princess's intercourse with the Carmelites of Compiègne, during the yearly visits paid by the Court to the *château* that, lying on the borders of the royal forest, was, during the last century, the favourite residence of Napoleon III.

The Carmelites of Compiègne have lately been brought prominently before the Catholic world: sixteen of these holy Religious, who were beheaded for the Faith during the Reign of Terror, were beatified by Pope Pius X. in May, 1906. Some of these future martyrs were already members of the community when Queen Marie Leckzinska and her daughters visited the convent; indeed, one of them, Sœur Euphrasie Brard, was a

special favourite with the Queen, who delighted in her quaint humour.

Madame Louise in after-years often talked of these visits with the nuns of St. Denis, adding, with a smile, that unconsciously the Queen contributed more than any one to develop her religious vocation. Several volumes of *Meditations*, written by her own hand and published after her death, give us the daily history of the workings of her mind as day by day she neared the goal towards which Providence was leading her. It has been noticed that St. Ignatius' famous book, the *Spiritual Exercises*, reflects the military spirit of the soldier Saint of Loyola, so the *Meditations* of the royal daughter of France bear the impress of her splendid and ceremonious surroundings. They contain frequent allusions to the grandeurs of this world, to the strict obligations incumbent on those in high places to give good example to their inferiors, and the like.

There is not much mysticism about these outpourings of a mind that was above all practical, lucid, and sincere, but a leading thought gradually dominated the writer: that of making her life an expiation for her father's sins. The glamour with which youth had once invested her surroundings gradually faded as time went on, and Madame Louise, as she grew older, realized the perils and abuses that were slowly sapping the very foundations of the throne. The crushing expenses entailed upon the country by the Seven Years' War, the defeat of the French armies at Rosbach, the loss of Canada, and, within the kingdom, the expulsion of the Society of Jesus, increased the misery and discontent of the people on the one hand, and on the other proclaimed the triumph of the philosophical and free-thinking party. Contrary to her usual habits, Marie Leckzinska, for once, interfered in politics on behalf of the Jesuits, but her mediation was ignored, and Madame Louise, her mother's confidant, was able to measure the strength of the evil influences that swept along Louis XV. in their onward course. In 1762, she was then twenty-five years old, the princess made her will, and expressed her desire to be buried in the habit of St. Teresa, a circumstance that proves, not indeed that her vocation was ripe, but that her affection for the Order had taken shape; then came the Queen's death, and from that moment the incipient vocation of her youngest daughter becomes more clearly defined: "I have compared the state of a princess to the state of a Carmelite," she wrote, "and I have decided that the state of a Carmelite is the best."

Quietly she began, under pretence of observing a medical régime, to live on dry bread, to the dismay of her *chef*, who complained somewhat bitterly that his mistress disdained his most appetizing creations. Under her robes of silk and damask she wore a rough serge tunic, given to her by the Prioress of Compiègne, and when her attendants marvelled at this unusual adjunct to her apparel, she assured them that it was efficacious in curing rheumatism! The *Rule of St. Teresa* was the subject of her constant study; she kept the precious volume in a small box, the key of which never left her person, and with the practical precision that characterized her she carefully examined every item of the rule of life that she wished to embrace.

Madame Louise's chief confidant was the Archbishop of Paris, Christophe de Beaumont, the most eminent prelate of his day. He alone, besides the princess's confessor, was acquainted with her resolve to become a nun and with her final choice of the Order of St. Teresa. At first, she seems to have vaguely thought of Fontevrault, endeared to her by the memories of her happy childish days, but her sacrifice to be acceptable must, she thought, be as complete as possible, and life among the white-robed Religious of the royal abbey was soft when compared to the austereities of the Carmel.

In spite of his indifference and immorality, Louis XV. was, as regards his daughters, indulgent and even affectionate, and in his intercourse with them there was none of that latent hostility that had marked his attitude towards his heir.

Madame Louise, when she finally made up her mind, resolved to apprise him of the fact, but, unwilling to inflict the blow herself, she begged the Archbishop, her counsellor and confidant, to acquaint the King with a decision which was the outcome of long years of meditation, prayer, and self-examination.

Mgr. de Beaumont discharged his commission in January, 1770; the King's surprise was great and, to do him justice, his emotion seemed sincere as, clasping his forehead with both hands, he exclaimed: "*C'est cruel, c'est cruel!*" However," he added, "if God asks for her, I cannot refuse her; I will give you my answer in a fortnight."

On the 18th of February, Louis XV. wrote to his daughter giving her the desired permission and, immediately, Madame Louise sent for the Abbé Bertin, who was ecclesiastical Superior of the Carmelites of St. Denis; she learnt from him what she already suspected, that the monastery was extremely

poor, so poor indeed that the nuns had just finished a novena to our Lady, to implore her assistance in their pressing necessities.

This determined the princess's choice and, without further hesitation, she quietly made her final preparations ; she provided for the welfare of her servants and secured a written promise from her father that her intentions in this respect should be carried out.

Meantime, the Abbé Bertin went to St. Denis, and much to the surprise of the simple-minded nuns, made certain arrangements within the monastery ; the community, from motives of economy, only drank cider ; he ordered them to buy some wine, and he had a rope placed to serve as a bannister along the steep and narrow staircase of the convent. The Superiorress timidly remonstrated, pointing out that these expenses were useless, but her observations were put aside without further explanations ; even the community that she was about to join was to know nothing of the princess's jealously-guarded secret.

Her sisters were equally ignorant of the impending change, and it speaks volumes for our heroine's power of self-control that she was able to keep an unmoved countenance before her family and the world at large.

On the 11th of April, 1770, at daybreak, a royal carriage, which the princess had ordered the previous day, stood at the entrance of the palace. Madame Louise had informed her lady in waiting, the Princess de Ghistelles, and her gentleman in attendance, M. de Quincerot, that as she intended to go to St. Denis she required their company, but desired no other escort. The fact that the late Queen was buried in the royal basilica seemed to explain her youngest daughter's visit, and her command excited no surprise.

Thus, on that fair spring morning, when the stately palace, the park, and woods were bathed in silence, did Louise de Bourbon bid adieu to her royal surroundings ! She took the step alone and in silence ; no loving sisters were there to weep over her departure, no faithful dependants to marvel at the renunciation of the daughter of kings ! *Mesdames* slept quietly under their damask hangings while, pale, quiet, self-controlled, the princess crossed the great courtyard and drove away for ever from her home.

Those who are acquainted with the western environs of Paris can easily trace the royal traveller's progress during that eventful morning. At Sèvres she changed horses, then pursued

her way along the Bois de Boulogne, in those days a royal forest. At Clichy she again changed horses, and finally reached St. Denis, where on entering the town she ordered her coachman to drive to the Carmelite convent, not to the abbey where the Kings of France have for centuries slept their last sleep. At St. Denis, as at Versailles, no one, except the Abbé Bertin, knew of the princess's decision, indeed the portress at first declined to open to her. Finally, *Madame*, by right of her rank as a daughter of the royal house, was permitted to enter the enclosure. Before speaking to the nuns, who, all unconscious of her arrival, were pursuing their usual quiet routine, she went straight to the parlour and, standing herself *within* the iron grating, she summoned her attendants, who, perplexed and alarmed at their mistress's conduct, had remained outside. In a few words she informed them that they must return without her, that she intended to stay in the convent. The Princess de Ghistelles fainted, M. de Quincerot expostulated and protested until Madame Louise produced a paper in the King's hand-writing authorizing her to remain at the monastery. Even the wrathful *écuyer* had to yield at the sight of the momentous scrap of paper that discharged him from his responsibility, and, with the weeping lady in waiting, he reluctantly turned his back on the poor home that his royal mistress had chosen to make her own.

BARBARA DE COURSON.

St. Bernardine of Siena in Art.

IN purely religious art of the *quattrocento* there is no figure of saint more memorable and more appealing than that of the great friar-preacher of the Franciscan Order, St. Bernardine of Siena. Not St. Francis bearing upon him the marks of the Stigmata, not the boyish St. Antony in adoration before the Divine Child, were to the painters of that age themes more inspiring than the pale ascetic preacher bearing in his hands the sacred monogram of Him whose name he invoked throughout the length and breadth of Northern Italy. Visitors to Siena, and more especially visitors to the delightful exhibition of ancient Sienese art held three years ago in the Palazzo Comunale, need hardly be reminded how prominent a figure the Saint has been in the art of his native city. Over and over again, in fresco, in altar-piece, in early wood-engravings, we find the familiar form of the aged friar, tall and gaunt in his Franciscan habit, with shaven head and toothless jaw and wide sunken eyes illuminated by an expression of such appealing tenderness, such glowing spirituality that all trace of austerity is obliterated. It is thus, with greater or less skill, that St. Bernardine is portrayed not only by many a forgotten artist of the later Sienese School, but by men such as Vecchietta, to whom is attributed an authentic portrait, by Neroccio di Landi, one of the greatest masters of Renaissance Siena, and above all by Sano di Pietro, most tender and mystical of painters, who seemingly never wearied of reproducing the familiar features of the great Saint who shares with St. Catherine the homage of the hill city. And if Sodoma himself—who, after studying in the school of Leonardo, spent his most prolific years in Siena—was less markedly inspired by the popular preacher than when he painted St. Catherine in ecstasy for the great brick church of St. Dominic on the hill above Fontebranda, the little Oratory of St. Bernardine, under the shadow of San Francesco, is none the less a worthy shrine to the memory of Siena's greatest Franciscan son. In executing

the series of frescoes and decorative designs with which walls and ceiling are covered, Sodoma had the assistance of Pacchia and Beccafumi, and it is to the former that we owe one of the most beautiful and dignified presentments of the Saint that have come down to us.

Nor must it be assumed that the personality of Bernardine appealed only to the artists of his native city. In Umbria he was scarcely less beloved than in Tuscany, and Umbrian artists from Alunno onwards have delighted to do him honour. It was he who inspired that enchanting series of panels by Perugino's master, Fiorenzo di Lorenzo, in which are depicted with an indescribable gaiety and sprightliness certain miracles for which the Saint was held in renown, a series constituting one of the treasures of the Perugia gallery. At Perugia, as at Siena, he has his Oratory, the *façade* decorated with exquisite tinted bas-reliefs by Agostino Ducci. But it was reserved to Pinturicchio, in one of his happiest, most mystical moods, to paint what is, in my opinion, the most perfect pictorial monument to the preacher in existence, his "Glorification" in the little chapel of the Ara Cœli church in Rome. Neglected as these frescoes are, damaged alike by time and restoration, they remain an incomparable expression of the popular veneration that St. Bernardine aroused in almost as high a degree as did the *poverello* of Assisi himself. The dignified figures of the three Franciscan saints admirably posed in the spacious landscape, the lovely floating angels, the pale luminous atmosphere, all combine to reveal an artist of far deeper religious emotion than one would have anticipated in the gay and courtly decorator of the Siena Library. And, once again, it was St. Bernardine who was the inspiration. We may well ask ourselves, in the face of a popularity so widespread, who this Bernardine was, why his influence was so potent, and how his personality was brought home to so many of the great artists of his century.

In his Preface to the Life of the Saint, M. Paul Thureau-Dangin,¹ to whom I am indebted for much of my information, points out very truly that whereas a marvellous artistic creativeness in art and in literature, founded on a passion for classical models, has overshadowed every other characteristic of the period known to us loosely as that of the Italian Renaissance, there existed, in direct antagonism to this seemingly

¹ *St. Bernardin de Sienne* (Plon, Paris). This work has been translated into English by Baroness G. von Hügel (Dent, 1896), price 4s. 6d.

pagan tendency, an opposing current of sanctity and asceticism, exemplified not only in the austere figure of Savonarola in Florence, but, at a somewhat earlier date, by saints and preachers of the Franciscan Order scattered throughout the peninsula. It is to this group of reformers within the Church that St. Bernardine belongs, a set of men stern indeed in their denunciations of sin and vice, worn and emaciated by their own penitential practices, but, in their outlook on life and in their relations with others softened by some measure of the tenderness of their seraphic founder, and touched with that spirit of holy joy which, in a special sense, it has been the privilege of the Franciscan Order to foster. Thus, in a very real way, they were the friends of the poor and the outcast, sharing in their life, participating in their sufferings, and leading them back to the fold less by the horrors of Hell than by the compelling power of Christ's love for man.

Bernardine then was of the people, a mendicant friar, a wandering preacher, trudging from town to town, gathering his congregations now in the churches, now in the open piazza, much as the Salvation Army gathers them to-day. His sermons were emphatically evangelical and hortatory; he came to preach Christ crucified, to urge evil doers of every rank to repentance, to change men's hearts and reform men's lives by the power of the Holy Name that was for ever upon his lips. In an age and a land characterized by the ferocity of its enmities and the recklessness of its law-breakers it was his special mission to teach afresh the ideal of Christian charity, to heal dissensions and reconcile family feuds and compel adversaries to exchange the kiss of peace. That his success was phenomenal we know from abundant contemporary sources.

It is in keeping with those frequent and vivid contrasts which impress every student as characteristic of mediæval history that it should have been precisely Siena to produce this peace-bringing Saint. For Siena, throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, shared with Perugia an unholy pre-eminence in violence of faction-strife and frequency of murder and massacre, a state of things testified to even to-day by the sombre palaces of that period, with rare, heavily-grilled windows high up in the walls that face the narrow streets, palaces built not for comfort but for safety. Yet just as Perugia was to be the centre of the most purely religious school of painting that even Italy has produced, so Siena could boast not a few of her citizens among

the saints and *beati* of the Church. Bernardine was no unique example of sanctity. In the very year (1380) in which he was born Catherine of Siena died, and she herself was born but a few months before the city was decimated by that terrible visitation of the Black Death which brought Blessed Bernard Tolomei and his monks from their austere retreat on Monte Oliveto to the assistance of the unhappy city from whose luxury and temptations they had fled in the days of her prosperity. No true appreciation of the social condition of the Italian cities can be arrived at without taking into account the alternating phases of religious fervour and wild lawlessness through which not only individuals but whole towns seem to have passed. And the recurrent periods of penance and restitution were in many instances due to the preaching and example of the mendicant Orders, Dominican or Franciscan, whose hold on the people is a factor of considerable significance. They preached "revivals" on a large scale, at once more widespread in their influence and more lasting in their effects than the modern variety with which we are familiar. When the revival preacher happened to be a saint the results were such as no man can estimate.

Bernardine's preaching was the practical outcome of fifteen years of prayer and silence within the seclusion of his Order. He was Guardian of the humble little friary of the strict observance that still crowns the rock above Fiesole, and which owed its origin to a similar movement of conventional reform as that which endowed the Dominicans with the more celebrated monastery on the slope of the hill, when, in 1417, the divine call to missionary preaching came to him. He at once prepared to obey. There followed, until his retirement to Capriola, another fifteen years of almost daily preaching and travelling, years of ceaseless and exhausting labour. The humble *début* of the then unknown friar was made at Milan, under the rule of the last of the Visconti, and after his second Lent the fame of "the good little friar, so miserably clad," to quote the words of an early admirer, was fully established. All Lombardy clamoured to hear him, and within the next few years he gave missions in all the large towns, Bergamo, Como, Brescia, Mantua, Cremona, besides preaching in the innumerable villages through which he passed on foot. Later he visited Venice, Verona, Ferrara, and so to Bologna and Florence; thence home to his native Siena. His custom was to preach daily, soon after Mass, and his sermons lasted three or four hours. Whole populations would

flock to hear him, and country-folk would stream into town before dawn so as to secure at least standing room. For such congregations even the great churches that the Franciscans, like the Dominicans, had built in many towns with vast empty naves for the very purpose of facilitating popular preaching, were wholly inadequate, and many of his sermons had to be delivered in the open air. Sometimes when the peasants were at work all day he would preach to them through the night, and even then his sermons were, according to modern ideas, of excessive length. Yet we are told by an eye-witness that everywhere and at all times he was listened to with "inconceivable attention."

One great secret of his success was the skill with which he suited his sermons to the needs of his hearers. In Lombardy, his first aim was to reconcile Guelf and Ghibelline, divided from each other by a blind hatred that had passed down from father to son; in Venice he denounced usury and immorality, at Ferrara luxury of living and immodesty in dress. At Bologna he won the people over from their besetting sin of card-playing and gambling with such effect that the last days of Lent saw a blazing bonfire into which dice and playing-cards were flung. Similar scenes were enacted at Florence, where Bernardine would seem to have inaugurated a reform that Savonarola was to pursue half a century later. As the result of his sermons in Santa Croce against the prevailing vices of that pleasure-loving city, women brought their false hair and all the objects of their personal adornment and burnt them in public. One wonders how fastidious modern congregations would respond to such blunt denunciations of popular weaknesses, such candid handling of difficult questions. Doubtless even in Bernardine's day there was a scoffing and scandalized minority, but the protesting voices have long since been stifled by the overwhelming evidence of the widespread spiritual awakening wrought by the burning words of the "good little friar."

It is easy for us to reconstruct the scene of the Saint's preaching in his native Siena, to which his return at the height of his public career was welcomed with civic honours and a widespread curiosity. The tall Torre della Mangia and the Palazzo Comunale with its stately Gothic *façade* still exist as in Bernardine's day, and before them lies the world-famous Campo in its beautiful shell-like curves across which has swept the whole history of the city. Here, in a pulpit erected against the wall of the palace, Bernardine preached daily for fifty days,

having first celebrated Mass. Every detail of the occurrence is supplied to us by no less an artist than Sano di Pietro in a painting preserved in the *Duomo* chapter-house, where we see the emaciated preacher holding aloft a square tablet bearing the Holy Name, the civic authorities in a reserved space, and the Campo filled with a crowd of kneeling listeners, the white-veiled women to the left, the men to the right. Among the young men on one such occasion was the gifted humanist Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, whose adventurous career, culminating in the papal throne, is so delightfully chronicled on the walls of the *Duomo* library, and Aeneas records that his emotion was so great at the preacher's words that he almost became a friar himself. Nor was he unmindful of this early favourable impression, and in later years showed himself a protector of the strict observance which was to flourish so marvellously under the guiding hand of Bernardine.

Nothing is more difficult than to test in after-years the value of preaching. Written sermons are usually dull reading, and the spell of voice and personality once lost, it becomes well-nigh impossible to account for the extent or cause of a great preacher's influence. Little light is thrown on the problem in the present instance by the five volumes of sermons in Latin that have come down to us, for obviously they contain merely the groundwork of discourses delivered in the colloquial Italian of the *quattrocento*, and often indeed, as the preacher himself has assured us, in the dialect of the district in which he found himself. Much more can be inferred from a series of forty-five *Prediche Volgari*, whose preservation we owe to the zeal of a Siense admirer, and which may be assumed to have been delivered more or less as they have been recorded, always pre-supposing that the scribe was familiar with some efficient form of shorthand. From them, at least, we gain an impression of Bernardine's vivid colloquial oratory, his apposite anecdotes, his caustic comments, his power of taking his hearers at one moment at their own level, at another of lifting them up into high spiritual regions. Yet even after studying the selected passages from the *Prediche* with which M. Thureau-Dangin has supplied his readers, we should fall far short in our estimate of Bernardine's powers of that which was clearly current among his contemporaries, were it not for the historical evidence of the results achieved by his preaching. We know how he, and he alone, possessed the power to make peace between the rival

factions of his own city, and how on one occasion (1431), he was sent for in all haste when war against Florence appeared imminent, and prevailed on his fellow-townsmen to lay down their arms. We know the surprising impetus given by him to the convents of the strict observance, and the galaxy of Franciscan saints he inspired and trained: St. John Capistran, St. James of the Marches, Blessed Albert of Sarteano, Blessed Bernardine of Feltre, and others less known to fame. Finally, we know how, when he was summoned to Rome as a "sower of scandal and superstition" by his advocacy of devotion to the Name of Jesus, Martin V. and the papal Court had but to hear the teaching of Bernardine from his own lips in order to be wholly convinced—in spite of earlier prejudices—of the mystical beauty and entire orthodoxy of his doctrine. Doubtless his oratorical gifts counted for much in all this, but I am inclined to believe that his sanctity counted for infinitely more. And it was by the intensity of his own personal love of our Lord, and by the correspondence of his own daily life with that which he preached to others, far more than by any flights of pulpit eloquence that he accomplished what was the crowning work of his life, propagation of devotion to the Holy Name. The Name of Jesus was never absent from his lips; the sacred monogram, inscribed on a tablet and surrounded with golden rays, was always in his hands, always held aloft before men's eyes during his sermons. Taught as Bernardine taught it, the I.H.S. became the symbol of a renewed and purified Christianity, and men placed it upon their houses, and carried it on their persons as a testimony to that change of heart and reformation of life on which they had entered at the preacher's bidding. In many towns the tablets bequeathed by Bernardine became objects of the deepest veneration, and in his native Siena the symbol has adorned the *façade* of the Palazzo Comunale from that day to this. The devotion not only spread throughout Italy with extraordinary rapidity, but was carried across the Alps by Franciscan friars, so that even in the lifetime of our Saint, St. Colette, urging the reform of the Poor Clares, took the Name of Jesus as the sign manual of her mission, and Joan of Arc, as all will remember, refused to go into battle save carrying a banner on which it was inscribed.

It was precisely this devotion, appealing so powerfully to the popular imagination, which became translated into the popular religious art of the time. To the painters of the

quattrocento Bernardine stood as the type of devotion to the Name of Jesus. What her wheel is to St. Catherine, or the gridiron to St. Laurence, so is the I.H.S. to the friar preacher, as much an integral part of him as his Franciscan habit or his long pointed chin ; and taking it for granted that devotion to the Holy Name was but the outward expression of a personal love of our Lord, a love which is the bed-rock of Catholic faith, it follows that the unquestionable popularity of St. Bernardine among artists was not a mere casual preference for a picturesque personality, but the expression in art of what was one of the strongest spiritual influences of the fifteenth century. And here we find the answer to the questions with which we began. In the treatment of St. Bernardine as an artistic theme we have what has long seemed to me an admirable illustration of the intimate relations that existed in his day between religion and art, and between both religion and art and the daily life of the common people. To-day art has no relation to the common life of the people ; it is a luxury of the rich, a product of the select few. There appears to be scarcely any common ground on which art and religion can meet, and no available medium by which the spiritual ideals of the people, where they exist, can find expression through art. That things were far otherwise in the centuries preceding the Renaissance we know, and the life of Bernardine of Siena is typical of a social state which, with all its admitted evils, possessed valuable possibilities of spiritual growth, not the least of which was this spontaneous visualizing of the purest idealism of the people in fresco and altar-piece.

VIRGINIA M. CRAWFORD.

Further Light on Oates's Plot.

IN January the Historical Manuscripts Commission issued a volume containing matters of interest to students of the Popish Plot.¹ The chief interest lies in the letters of Sir Robert Southwell, Clerk to the Privy Council, to the Duke of Ormonde, written in the years 1677 to February, 1679—1680, when he ceased to hold the appointment. The nature and value of the letters is fairly set out in the carefully-written Introduction, for which we are indebted to Mr. C. Litton Falkiner:

From October, 1678, onwards, Sir Robert's letters are almost exclusively filled with details of Oates' Plot and the proceedings in connection therewith, both at the Privy Council and in Parliament. So much [says Mr. Falkiner] has been written of late years on the subject of the Plot that there is no occasion to summarize here the incidents which the correspondence now printed presents with so much detail. It cannot be said that the letters contain any new facts which sensibly modify the view which history has long since passed on the Plot and all connected with it. They do not afford, for example, any fresh clue to the mystery of the death of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, whose fate has quite recently been made the subject of careful investigation by more than one writer. But students of the period will find that Sir Robert Southwell's comments on the developments of Oates' accusations as they were unfolded from day to day do much to illuminate one of the most extraordinary episodes in the history of English politics.

And the details here given come from a man of high character, in a high position, knowing at first hand all that was going on. Of the existence of "a most hellish design against the life of His Majesty," Southwell was, at least in January, 1678-9, "as convinced as of his creed." Charles has been often, but perhaps unjustly, blamed for not exercising the Crown's prerogative of pardon in favour of the victims of the conspiracy.

¹ *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, K.P., preserved at Kilkenny Castle.* New Series, vol. iv.

Here is a passage showing once more how reluctant was his consent to executions demanded by almost the entire country :

Mr. Speaker told him frankly how universal an expectation was fixed upon the execution of Ireland, Grove, and Pickering, who are condemned. But His Majesty did, on the other side, manifest wonderful reluctance thereunto—that he had no manner of satisfaction in the truth of the evidence, but rather of its falsehood, and that when they were so busy in revenging the innocent blood of Godfrey, it was hard for him to consent to the shedding of more: and that he well remembered what his father suffered for consenting to the Earl of Strafford's death. Most of the Board did labour with His Majesty to show the disparity of the cases, the ill-grounded scruple His Majesty had taken, and that the evidence and trial were much fairer than His Majesty had been told, and that he could not be answerable for any wrong done or innocent blood shed, but it lay upon the witnesses and jury, if such a thing could be thought of in this case. None laboured herein more vigorously than the Lord Treasurer, Lord Chancellor, and the Lord Lauderdale, who, it seems, had in private done their uttermost before. At last it was ordered that when the Judges come on Friday, so many of them as sat upon that trial are to inform His Majesty how the proofs appeared. And the Bishops that are of the Board are then to be present and to assist His Majesty as to the point of conscience in this matter.

In another passage we see how great was the danger run by Pepys through the false accusations of "one Colonel Scott . . . a great rambler in the world and of very ill fame." To Sir Robert Southwell it appeared that Pepys, "however prepared, must certainly be destroyed."

The detailed information given by the Clerk of the Council has a direct bearing upon one point. In the whole story of the supposed murder of Godfrey, nothing is more strange than the shifting of the supposed scene of the crime. Bedloe, the first "discoverer"—rewarded for his discovery with £500—placed the murder in the Upper Court of Somerset House, where the Queen was in residence at the time. The choice of Somerset House by Bedloe, probably acting in concert with Oates, is easily understood: as the Queen's residence, Somerset House might be regarded as the headquarters of the Catholics. There was also, with another object, a fixed plan of implicating the Queen in the supposed murder. Bedloe's deposition was made on November 7th. On December 21st, Prance was arrested by Bedloe, and induced to make "discoveries," to which,

after retracting them, he finally adhered. The stories told by the two men are contradictory in almost every single point. In particular, the scene of the murder was changed by Prance from the Upper Court of Somerset House to Somerset Water Gate, or Yard, a frequented passage leading to a landing-place on the Thames. Prance could as easily have been tutored to name the Upper Court as the Water Gate. The one story was as improbable, not to say as impossible, as the other: then why the change? The reason for the change has been supposed to be a fact alleged by James II. in his Memoirs: Bedloe

made a long narration of the manner which amazed the people at first, but upon recollection the King remembered he was at Somerset House himself at the very time he swore the murder was committed. This made His Majesty doubt the truth of what he said, and to send the Duke of Monmouth with Bedloe to Somerset House to show him upon the place where everything had passed. When the Duke of Monmouth returned, he told the King the room where Bedloe said he saw the body lie, was the Queen's backstairs which, being the common passage for all the Queen's servants, the place through which her meat was carried, and where the footmen constantly waited, confirmed the King in the belief of its being all a fiction: besides, his having been there at that time himself, made it impossible that a man should be assaulted in the Court, murdered, and hurried into the back-stairs, when there was a sentry at every door, a foot company on the guard, and yet nobody see or knew anything of it.

Since I quoted this passage in my book, *Who Killed Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey?*¹, I have seen that the point is not free from difficulty. Godfrey disappeared on Saturday, October 12, 1678, and was supposed to be murdered on the same day. Now, it is on record that the King went to Newmarket on Tuesday, October 1st.² The sentinels who gave evidence in the trial of Green, Berry, and Hill, fixed their recollection of the night on which the body was supposed to be removed (Wednesday, the 16th), by saying that it was the night the King came from Newmarket.³ It is notorious that the reports of these trials, revised by the Crown lawyers, are to be regarded with caution, even with suspicion, but no reason is apparent for doubting about these dates. Indirect confirmation of them is found in the manuscript records of the Privy Council, which I was allowed to inspect. The King was present at a meeting of

¹ P. 61.

² *State Trials*, vii. 30.

³ *State Trials*, vii. 207, 208, 209.

the Council on September 30th, absent from meetings held on October 4th and 11th, and again present at the Council of the 16th. That the soldiers were right in the date of the King's return from Newmarket is proved by letters in the present volume, the writers being Sir H. Coventry and Sir Robert Southwell.¹

If James is right, then Charles, who had gone to Newmarket on the 1st, must have returned to London on or before the 13th, gone again to Newmarket, and finally returned to London on the 16th. That the King should have been in London on Saturday night, have returned to Newmarket and again been in London on the following Wednesday is quite possible. Newmarket is distant from London by road sixty miles. The journey was frequently made in a day. In June, 1670, Evelyn went from London to Burrow-Green, five and a half miles south of Newmarket, in a day.² On October 10, 1671, he went to Newmarket in a coach and six, changing horses thrice, "so by night we got to Newmarket."³ Pepys mentions that in March, 1668, the King set out for Newmarket at three o'clock:⁴ in April, 1669, "betimes."⁵ On September 26, 1671, he started at about four o'clock.⁶ These early hours show that the journey was to be completed in the day. If the King left London on the morning of Sunday the 13th he would arrive in Newmarket in the evening. When the disappearance of Godfrey became known, and it was said that he had been murdered by Catholics, there was great excitement. Charles had already been blamed for going to Newmarket on the 1st. His absence would now be much more serious. A messenger despatched on Monday to recall him would reach Newmarket on Monday night, giving ample time for the King's return by Wednesday.

But though the movements detailed are not impossible, they are extremely improbable. It is not to be supposed that so singular an event as the King's sudden return and departure would have escaped the minute observation recorded in these pages. But more than this, Sir Robert Southwell expressly refers to "the King's absence at Newmarket" at this very time.⁷ We must therefore conclude that the King's recollection or

¹ Pp. 217—459.

² *Diary*, edit. 1850, ii. 47.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 63.

⁴ Edit. Wheatley, viii. 252.

⁵ *Ibid.* viii. 307.

⁶ *Hist. MSS. Comm.* rep. 12, app. 7, p. 84.

⁷ P. 468.

James's record of it was mistaken. The passage to which reference has just been made runs thus:

Bedloe went with these Lords [the Earl of Ossory, Lord Clarendon and Lord Gerard] and showed them the place where he saw the dead body lie, which it seems is a lobby or place for servants to attend in. And this being done while the Queen was there at Somerset House for many days during the King's absence at Newmarket, the Queen's servants deride the whole story as a falsehood and impossible thing, and accuse this man for a notorious robber and highwayman.

This is dated November 9, showing that Bedloe's character was known at the outset.

The probability seems to be that, wildly improbable as the story of the murder in Somerset Water Gate was, it appeared less impossible than that which assigned the murder to the courtyard of the Queen's palace. At all events it served its purpose: in spite of its improbability, in spite of the violent contradictions between Bedloe and Prance, it sufficed to hang three innocent men.

ALFRED MARKS.

Lois.

CHAPTER XLVI.

NO HEALING.

KATEY hired a large cottage, the nearest she could find to the Kellys'. The family who lived there said they did not want to make money out of the lady's distress, and if she just paid for their lodgings they would go to the village and stay in separate houses with friends. Katey gave them a large sum, as it seemed to them. But they had given too, and not less generously than she.

Lois hung for many days between life and death ; then the balance turned in favour of life.

She must be very patient, very quiet, she was told, and not try to move ; *not try to move*—for it was so essential to her to gain strength first.

She heard quietly, and made no answer. She did not know Katey was near. She was not to know—yet—Katey had said.

Margaret Kelly was much with her. Lois liked Margaret ; she had seen a great deal of her ; and Margaret's voice was sweet, and there was a very pleasant atmosphere about her, as Lois felt.

Margaret brought her beautiful flowers—they were sent, she said, by a lady who had heard of Miss Moore's accident, and was so sorry for her.

"I didn't know there were any ladies—any ladies who could send such flowers as these, I mean—about here, Margaret."

"Well, there is, miss. Maybe flowers is cheaper in Ireland nor in England."

Margaret told her many things she thought would interest her, and Lois liked to hear the ripple of her talk. She told her one day how she had been subject to bad headaches, and how she had been cured. This was after Lois had had a long spell of pain, which had been brought under, Margaret was sure, by

the Rosary they had said for her, father and mother and all. But she did not tell Lois this belief: only when Lois said her head was quite well now, Margaret smiled and said, "I knew it would get well, miss."

"When I was thirteen or fourteen," said Margaret, "I used to have dreadful bad headaches. They went on for a couple of years. My skull seemed all open. And then mother heard how Father Charless—he was one of the Passionate Fathers—was healing people. Yes, he could heal! Then my mother took me to Harold's Cross—that's where the Passionate Fathers live—and we waited outside the church till Father Charless came out to me. He told me to go three times up to the altar. There was a lot of people kneeling there at the rails. Father Charless signed me with the cross three times on the forehead. He had a relic. I never saw it: he had it in the heart of his hand. I felt much better. I came again the next day, and I was quite cured."

"Did the headaches never come back again?" said Lois.

"No, never, miss. Then there was my little cousin. When he was about nine, he had a sort of a red film over his eyes, just like a bit of raw meat. An' he went an' made his confession, an' we all made confession for him. The first time he went to Father Charless he was much better, an' he could see to walk home. He was quite cured, an' now he's a fine young man, an' nothing wrong with him."

"Was everybody cured that went to Father Charless?" Lois asked.

"Oh, no, miss. There was some other people not cured. They wanted to be cured all at once. You see—if you believe!"

"Ah!" said Lois, trying, for courtesy sake, to put some interest into her tone. "And he never was blind again? The film never came back?"

"Never, miss. If you saw him now, you'd admire him, you would. A fine, strong, plentiful young man, with never an ache or a pain."

"That's very nice," said Lois gently.

The words she had heard, half negligently, half as one hears a tale of things remote seemed to come back to her. These stood out, "We all made confession for him."

"What did you mean by saying, 'We all made confession for him,' Margaret?"

"We said the *Confiteor* for him, miss. Ah, you don't know it! To tell God we were sorry for all he had done wrong."

Lois did know it, but she only said, "Say a bit of it, Margaret, if you don't mind."

Rapidly, so rapidly that it would have seemed an irreverent rattling out of words, had she not seen the look in the girl's face—a look that swiftly brought a remembrance of Croyde—Margaret said the *Confiteor*.

"Thank you, Margaret; thank you. Now, I'll be quiet for a little, I think."

And Margaret left her.

She lay back there, looking straight before her to the lovely hills. The lights and shadows were playing on the furze, and on the brown and bronze and yellow and green of the autumn-touched bracken—for it was autumn, though autumn lying on the skirts of summer; and on the ragworts, too, whose passing was so much more beautiful than their prime, those lights and shadows played; great clumps, showing the richness of brown tints, and tipped with little white feathery tufts, that here and there still kept a yellow floret or two; the stalks red-brown, with the crisp curled leaves, brown too, and drooping. She knew how they looked on sunless days; but now the westering sun was upon them.

She heard the voice of the stream: the stream that, lower down, turned the paper-mill. She heard the twitter of birds and the homelier cheeping of chickens. Voices came up from the little shop where they sold flour, and soap, and cigarettes, and pipes, and cotton, and pills—there were pills in the window and pills on the shelves—and lemonade, and tea, and sugar, and penny packets of stationery and—everything.

The silver birch in front was gleaming in the setting sun. The rustling of the aspen leaves in the light wind was like the patter of rain.

"We all made confession for him." What did it mean? If—she were a Catholic—she might make confession for Katey—for Katey!

She laughed within herself a bitter little laugh.

Then she saw all the little nearer things. The window was swaying slightly with a baby ghost of a creak. There was a jam-pot with big daisies, and a vase with a bunch of roses, brought by one of the cottagers near for "the poor lady" whose case evoked so much sympathy, and the rarer flowers by her side,

sent by "the lady who was sorry for her." But her thoughts flew out again, to the pines and the hills and the streams, and then they brought her to stand as she had once stood, by the little cross erected at the side of the tram-line, with its face to the little police barrack : the orbéd stone cross with its clumsily cut inscription to the memory of Mary Mahoney, who had been killed by the unlooked-for and unwatched-against moving of the tram : "Mary Mahoney, aged sixteen years."

Lois shuddered inwardly, not because that young life had gone out, but because her own life was still unquenched. For, she had come to feel sure now that she would not recover though the doctor refused to say so, and Sir Michael Geraghty was coming again.

And a few days later she heard her doom : the doom of hopeless invalidism ; crippledom, she called it. She heard it with a calm face and a bearing that made the doctor say, "You are one of the bravest people I have ever seen."

Margaret told Katey how she had taken it. Katey knew better than Margaret what that calm must mean. And Katey's heart felt like to break.

Katey had been sure Aloysia Egerton ought to be told about Lois's accident. She felt as if she must not write to her : so she sent her a paper with the marked account of it. And this came to Croyde as Giles Egerton was giving up his stewardship, calmly making the commendation of his spirit into the hands of God. The illness, the long, sluggish disease, was rapid at the end. He said this was well : he was glad that watching and anxiety would not press on the daughter : he asked that, if possible, Ralph should come to him, and Ralph was with him when he died in Aloysia's arms.

He remembered Lois when speaking to Aloysia about some small arrangements not set down in his will : he wondered she had not written : he was sure Aloysia would not forget her where they had together prayed for her.

And so Aloysia did not know what had happened in Ireland until after Lois knew the worst. Then even, it was almost accidentally that she heard. A young girl who was helping her to look over newspapers and periodicals that were to be sorted out for burning or for giving away, saw the notice, and recognizing the name as that of the lady who had come to Croyde earlier in the year, showed it to Aloysia. The paper was then some weeks old.

CHAPTER XLVII.

EUTHANASIA.

LOIS was lying quite still. Her silence, her calm, seemed sometimes to terrify Margaret; for she would lie for hours, only obeying the wish that she should take nourishment of some kind, and then shutting her eyes, as a sort of signal, they found that she wished not to be spoken to. Katey watched her through the chink of the badly shrunk door; saw her lie with eyes wide open; saw, too, waves of pain pass over her face; pain that she would have given much to be able to bear for her. She thought hard about the best plan for Lois's future: what must it be? And there Lois was lying. Katey slipped away to a little distance, where she could not see Lois, but could hear her bell; the little bell which she quite easily rang.

Lois in thought was walking along as she had done on Sundays—three Sundays—with Margaret to the village church four miles away. But it was one Sunday that was specially present to her because of the peculiar beauty of the day: one of those days that have something about them so exquisite that it must go with them, pass as they do, not lie upon the heart of other days. A lovely walk it was, down that country road, part of which ran by the river, and the whole of which was clothed upon with all manner of fairness of tree and bramble and wild flower. She entered the church again in spirit, where the old Passionist Father was holding a mission. At the stall outside they were selling wax candles, and beads, and crucifixes, and pictures of saints, all sorts of objects of piety.

She could see the old priest's kindly face; hear his voice in the homely address that every one listened to so attentively. He had begun by saying, "Come to Mass every morning this week, if ye can. Ye can come and say yer prayers at church instead of saying 'em at home. Ye can take a cup o' tea. Ye don't know how comfortable ye'll be after a cup o' tea. Sometimes, ye know, ye hurry over your prayers because ye haven't had a cup o' tea. The women may all have a cup o' tea—an' a bit o' bread and butter with it, if they like it." This prefaced the good, practical talk about seeking first the Kingdom of God and His justice. The strength, the tenderness, the touch here and there of humour, quickly passing, the perfect understanding of the lives of his hearers, the belief in the highest

and best for them ; all so new to Lois, and so strange, she remembered well.

And then the rest of the Mass, to her hitherto a feeble thing, unworthy of the unseen Power, if such there were : the tinkling of a poor little bell ; the bowed heads, the wave of something she realized was there, though she could not define it, throbbing through the worshippers ; wave of emotion, reverence, revelation, fruition, whatever it might be : something which had awed her as she had not been awed even at the great silence in St. Peter's at the Lifting-up. She had heard the Mass in its highest magnificence at Rome. She was hearing it now in the country where devotion is most devout, where love and worship go hand in hand.

Then had come the walk back, the numbers of people on foot, or in carts, in gigs, on side-cars, drawn by ass, or mule, or horse, greeting each other, making homely jokes, laughing, talking.

Then her thoughts flew to London. And the morning was a dank one and a foggy, and she was entering the room at the A.S.I.S., where an address was to be given by Mr. Ralph Comyn on the Religious Ideal.

Margaret came in ; she was privileged to do so. "Would you like to be read to a little, Miss Moore ? There's such a beautiful poem I think you would like—I know you like poetry."

Lois said, "Yes, please," only because she knew Margaret wanted to do it. And Margaret thought this a good sign of returning interest and growing strength.

It was a translation of Heine's *Procession at Kevlaar* that Margaret read, simply and quietly, and as if she loved to read it.

She read in the rhythmical words how the mother and son went together to Kevlaar, where the Mother of God was "dight in rich array," and had homage from rich and poor : they went that the heart of the sick son, Wilhelm, might be healed in him ; the heart that was broken when Gretchen died. They walked in the procession, singing, "We bless thy name, Marie !" Rich and poor were bringing offerings to her : waxen limbs, that limbs of theirs might be whole again ; waxen hands and feet ; and the offerers were made whole.

The mother took a wax-light,
And a heart thereof she made :
"By this thy heart in its sorrow"
The Mother of God shall aid.

And Wilhelm prayed to our Lady, telling her how he and his mother dwelt in her own Köln city ;

“ And near us once dwelt Gretchen—
Now is no Gretchen there—
Marie, a waxen heart I bring—
Heal thou my heart’s despair.

Heal thou my heart’s deep sorrow
So evermore shall be
My prayer to thee unfailing,
‘ We bless thy name, Marie ! ’ ”

That night when slept the mother,
Her sick son resting by,
The Mother of Jesus entered
The chamber silently.

Above the sick she bowed her,
And a light hand did lay
Upon his heart once gently,
Then smiling passed away.

And in her dreams the mother
Yet more had thought to see,
But that her sleep was troubled,
As the dogs bayed mournfully.

And the mother woke in the morning, and found her son with the flush of morning-red upon his dead face.

Her hands the mother folded ;
No word of grief spake she ;
But gently sang this only,
“ We bless thy name, Marie.”¹

Lois listened, and spoke—eagerly, passionately almost.

“ Ay, your Madonna heals the broken heart by death ! It’s the best way. But the useless limbs—the crippled, paralyzed limbs—ah ! I have seen plenty of offerings, Margaret—these *ex-votos*. But what of those who are not healed ? Of those who go on from morning to night, and at night wish for morning, and at morning wish for night ? ”

Katey heard, and every word stabbed her : and like a wounded thing, she crept away.

It was the next day that Margaret came in, and laid down that little white packet on the table, while she brought the tray to Lois with her jelly.

¹ I have quoted (from memory) from a translation by Charles Pelham Mulvany. I have been unable to verify it.

"What's that, Margaret? More medicine?"

"Oh, dear, no, miss; Bride brought it from Dublin just now. The poor old cat is so ill that we are going to put him out of pain."

"Oh, it's poison? Show it me, Margaret." She took it in her hand and read, "Cyanate of potassium." Margaret said, "We must be very careful, miss. There's very little, but a very tiny quantity is fatal. I'll put it away till it's wanted. I don't know why I brought it here at all. You don't want to be bothered about cats."

She put it on the chest of drawers near the window, and removed Lois's tray.

But when Margaret left the room—Lois liked to be alone as much as they would allow her—she forgot the packet. And Lois looking over, saw it. "A very tiny quantity fatal." The words rang in her ears. "A very tiny quantity fatal." What did "fatal" mean? The contents of that tiny packet would put an end to anyone's life—her life—Lois Moore's. What that tiny packet held was one of the forces that make for destruction: or for peace? Both, surely; destruction of bodily pain; destruction of mental torture; that mental torture that was with her when she woke and shadowed her in her dreams. The presence of the nurse, a refined and graceful woman, and the kindly and sweet presence of Margaret, and all the gracious sympathy that was about her might have kept the torture in check to some extent. But Lois wanted to be silent; wanted to think; wanted—she knew not what. Would it go on always? To face it for years—many years, they said she might live—perhaps in the ward of a pauper's sick home—a workhouse infirmary! She could never write any more. Her money must soon be gone—perhaps it was gone already, for she had signed a large cheque. She had dictated a letter to Mr. Harvey, asking if she might have payment now in full for the serial rights of the story in his magazine; explaining why she asked. And the kindest of letters had come back, enclosing the cheque and an extra hundred pounds, which he called an advance on whatever sum the publication in book form might bring in. And the words of sympathy and cheer that came too were good for Lois to have. But this would not last very long. Sir Michael's fee was a large one, and there would be bills to pay in various directions.

To go on—like this—and poor, helpless, growing old—no, it could not be. It must not be!

Euthanasia! Euthanasia! She could remember the discussions about it which had taken place at Katey's, and elsewhere, and how some of those people had agreed to make a little propaganda to spread the doctrine that a sufferer ought to be encouraged to put an end to his pain; because it was far more merciful to himself, far more kind to those around him than that he should drag on under a ghastly weight of suffering days and weary nights.

"What right has God—if there is a God—what right has He to ask me to live, when He has crushed me flat like this? If there is—oh, if after all there should be another life after this? If there is, surely I cannot be worse off there."

Oh, these wretched lingerings of superstition! Where did the voice come from, clear, loud, unrelenting? "Thou shalt do no murder!" Where but down the old ways of childhood and youth with their folly and their superstition, could it come? For was she not of those who, generation after generation, had breathed an atmosphere still impregnated with Christian thought and Christian law? This air of Free Thought, subtle, clear ether, let them call it if they will—it does not matter—was too—rarefied? or too gross? And she was sinking down to the lower level: or rising beyond it?

She called herself, "Coward." It was perhaps the last chance: some one might come and take the poison away. Close by her lay the expanding scissors, the "lazy tongs" which Katey's thought had provided, so that she might feel less helpless. She opened them and stretched them out. Yes, they would just reach the packet. It was caught, and she drew it towards her. It was in her hand. It was open, and raised to her lips.

She looked up, why she did not know, perhaps to say a mute good-bye to the things around. There, just opposite to her, it hung. It hung, no beautiful thing carved with exquisite skill, but a poor plaster Figure, soiled and chipped, on a poor wooden cross. That which has taught penitence and faith, and hope and love. That which taught the greatest scholar-saint more than he ever learned from all his books. That which for so many centuries has been reflected in hearts innocent, hearts holy, hearts penitent. That which will be the symbol of all help, all healing, all life, till time shall be no more.

In that moment, Lois *saw*.

CHAPTER XLVIII.

COR JESU.

MARGARET came in a few minutes later. She had knocked, but no answer had come ; and very softly she opened the door. Was Lois asleep ? What was that look on her face that Margaret had never seen before ? Something that almost awed her, and yet had in it what in a manner spoke of healing. She came close to her, and saw she was not asleep.

" You are better, Miss Moore ? "

" Yes, I am—better."

" Thank God."

" Margaret, say your Sacred Heart Litany for me."

And Margaret, with a joy that brought tears to her eyes, knelt before that crucifix, and rapidly crossing herself began the Litany of the Sacred Heart.

When she came to, " Heart of Jesus, source of life and holiness," she heard Lois whisper, *Have mercy on us.* " Heart of Jesus, atonement for iniquities," *Have mercy on us*, again that whisper.

And when Margaret said, " Heart of Jesus, our Resurrection and our Life," there came the fulness of the cry that never goes up unheard,

" Have mercy on me."

Margaret rose, and said, " There's something you'll be glad to hear, miss. Your cousin is come ! "

" My cousin ! Aloysia ! Oh, Margaret, where is she ? Let me see her."

" I am here !" and Aloysia was by her side ; Aloysia who, kneeling outside, had joined in the Litany indeed with all her heart.

It was late in the day, and Lois's room was being arranged for the night. Margaret picked up a packet which was lying on the floor near the window ; she supposed the wind had blown it down. Nurse's quick eye caught it in Margaret's hand. " What's that ? Oh, cyanate of potassium : what is it for ? "

" To put an end to poor old puss. The creature is so poorly and miserable that we thought——"

" You thought that was going to put an end to his sufferings, did you ? My dear, it would have done nothing of the kind.

They have given you cyanate of potassium, instead of cyanide, which, I suppose, was what you asked for. And a good thing too. Such frightfully dangerous stuff as cyanide of potassium ought not to be allowed to be sold like that. You deserve a lecture, my dear, anyhow, for leaving a thing about that you thought was poison. There now, don't be too sorry about it, but be careful another time."

"Indeed, and I will. Glory be to God!"

Lois looked up. "Nurse, was not that poison in Margaret's little packet?"

"No, Miss Moore, certainly not."

"And suppose someone had swallowed it?"

"Well, they would have been none the worse for it, as far as I know. Now, Miss Moore, let us dress you for the night."

When the preparations for the night were over, Lois said: "May I see Miss Egerton again?"

"She's coming to say good-night. But I shouldn't let her stay long, if I were you. She has been travelling, and ought to rest. You will see her comfortably to-morrow."

So, when Aloysia came, Lois just said, "Good night," and "Pray for me." But, in the night, when she knew that Lois was lying awake, Aloysia came to her; and Lois said a few words, just a very few, but words that held great cause for Aloysia's rejoicing.

EMILY HICKEY.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

The Montagnini Papers.

WERE a proof needed to show that the instructors of English public opinion have two sets of scales, one for weighing the conduct of men generally, another for weighing that of the Holy See and its adherents, it would be hardly possible to find a more conclusive proof than has been furnished by the comments of the English press on the seizure and publication of the Montagnini papers. We can conjecture how loud and many-tongued would be the outcry of these press people if a Catholic Government were to act in a similar way towards the representative of a Protestant power; and though no such case has arisen by which to test this conjecture, it is not hard to think of instances within the last half century when Protestant representatives at Catholic Courts have abused their position to encourage and assist revolutionary movements. We know too from actual experience what surprise and indignation our leader-writers can express when a newspaper correspondent, with no pretensions whatever to a diplomatic position, is bidden to leave promptly a country whose Government he has persistently accused, and with whose revolutionaries he is suspect of having been in close relations,—although there has been no attempt to confiscate papers, no forcible expulsion under police conduct, no approach even to a violation of diplomatic courtesies, and no violation of the laws or habits under which the offended country lived. Yet, with one or two honourable exceptions, our English newspapers have not uttered a word of protest against the outrage to which the Papal *chargé d'affaires* at Paris has been subjected, or a syllable to show that they regarded this outrage as otherwise than a perfectly proper and laudable proceeding. On the contrary they have welcomed this irregular publication with cordiality—as one which could supply piquant copy to scandal-loving readers, and might be

hoped to contain some revelations which with a little dressing up might be made to appear discrediting to the administration of the Holy See. They regarded the occasion, in other words, as one in which the end justifies the means.

But how monstrous an outrage it was, and in how many ways, has been ably exposed by Cardinal Merry del Val in the dignified letter of protest which he addressed at the time of the expulsion to the Courts at which the Holy See is represented. The text of this letter,—for what reason we cannot understand—was published by the *Messidor*, M. Buisson's paper, on April 22nd. We give it here entire, in view both of its official character and of the clear summary of the whole affair which it contains :

(Cardinal Merry del Val to M. X. . . . Nuncio Apostolic, or *charge d'affaires*, to the Holy See at X.).

Rome, Dec. 19th, 1906.

You are doubtless aware of what happened at Paris on the 11th of this month. The representatives of the judicial authority, accompanied by numerous police-agents, came without warning to the Palace of Mgr. Montagnini, the special *charge* of the Holy See for religious interests in France, and custodian of the archives of the Nunciature. After a minute perquisition they carried off the general protocols of the acts of the Nunciatures of Mgr. Chari and Mgr. Lorenzelli, and also the books of their administration as well as those of the Peter's Pence. Afterwards, Mgr. Montagnini was ordered to quit French territory, and was conducted to the frontier, just as if he were a criminal, by the police-agents, without even being permitted a delay of twenty-four hours, such as is never refused in similar circumstances.

It is scarcely necessary for me to point out the enormity of these facts, which are without precedent in our days among civilized nations. Even after the rupture of diplomatic relations, the residences of those who represent the powers are respected, and, most of all, the archives are considered inviolable. Moreover, the representatives of the Holy See in the different countries, even in those where they have no diplomatic character, are everywhere treated with special attention by the Governments; and there has not been a single case in which the archives of a Pontifical representative have been violated, even in times of strife and discord.

In particular, to have carried off the catalogue and the cypher which belonged to past Nunciatures is a grave offence not merely against the Holy See but also against all the civilized nations, to whom it is of the greatest interest that the secrecy of diplomatic documents should be respected. It must be added that the documents carried away might reveal secrets of great consequence for some nations, particularly as the French Government has in its telegraph offices

copies of the cypher telegrams, and could, with the aid of the cypher which it has seized, get to know the contents of them all.

Quite unfounded is the statement made in the French Chamber that the Nunciature ceased with the denunciation of the Concordat, and that the documents anterior to the rupture or those relating to foreign powers, will be returned. For not only has the Concordat never been officially denounced to the Holy See, but, as all the world knows, the promise of restitution notwithstanding, there remains the fact of the violation of the documents, and of the knowledge of their contents which the Government can obtain.

Quite apart, too, from considerations of a diplomatic order, it is evident that the Sovereign Pontiff, as Head of the Catholic Church, has ordinary and immediate spiritual jurisdiction over all Catholics throughout the world, over the clergy as well as the laity, and has, consequently, the right to communicate freely and directly, or through the intermediary of some assigned person, with the Bishops and the faithful. This evident right of the Roman Pontiff, based on the constitutions of the Church, has been openly violated by the French Government in the facts related.

But, beyond these grave observations, there is another important observation to make. All will understand that in the archives of a Pontifical legency there may be found documents dealing with secrets of the greatest delicacy relating to the conscience or honour of individuals, which ought, by natural law, to be religiously respected.

The French Government has pretended to justify its proceeding by accusing the *chargé d'affaires* of the Holy See of inciting three Paris *curés* to a violation of the Separation Law, by communicating to them the orders of the Holy See. This accusation is void of all foundation. Mgr. Montagnini has held no communication of any kind with the three *curés* in question, nor will any one be able to prove the contrary.

In the presence of such an offence, the Holy Father finds himself obliged to make an energetic protest. You are charged to communicate this protest to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, giving him this dispatch to read and a copy of it to keep.

(*Sd.*), RA CARDINAL MERRY DEL VAL.

"Even after the rupture of diplomatic relations," says the Cardinal, "the residences of those who represent the Powers are respected, and their archives are treated as inviolable." And "Diplomaticus," in his interesting article in the *Westminster Gazette* for April 9th—an article in which he shows himself hostile rather than favourable to the Holy See—testifies exactly to the same effect. After observing that "so learned an authority as M. Paul Fauchille, the editor of the *Revue Générale de Droit International Public*, has recently condemned the French

Government root and branch," and that "among practical diplomatists the whole incident is . . . regarded as a deplorable incorrection," this writer gives his own judgment as follows:

Whatever Mgr. Montagnini may have done he had beyond doubt a certain diplomatic character. He was the official custodian of the archives of the Nunciature, confided to him by the Nuncio, Mgr. Lorenzelli, when that prelate was handed his passports by the French Government, and his position and diplomatic immunities were precisely the same as those of the French Secretary of Embassy, to whom M. Courcel, the French Ambassador at the Vatican, handed over the care of his archives when he was recalled at the same time. . . . The fact that there was a rupture of diplomatic relations between the Republic and the Holy See does not in any way diminish the diplomatic character of these officials within their strictly defined functions. . . . In any case this was what the French Government did in Rome, and what was right in its case cannot be wrong in the case of the Vatican, and its representative in Paris. . . . But even supposing Mgr. Montagnini had lost his diplomatic character and immunities with the diplomatic rupture, it would still be very questionable whether the course adopted by the Government in regard to his papers was justifiable. In theory the proposal to discriminate between the archives of the Nunciature, and the "Italian priest's" private papers is sound enough, but in practice it is quite inadmissible. In order to discriminate, there must be—as, indeed, there has been—examination, and this of course is quite incompatible with the inviolability of the diplomatic documents proper.

It is surely difficult in the face of these arguments to deny that the diplomatic proprieties have been shockingly violated, but "Diplomaticus" in the same article, half suggests that the French Government was morally justified because Mgr. Montagnini, or rather the Pontifical Government through Mgr. Montagnini, was "meddling in party politics," and "exercising certain functions of the Nunciature office, which the French Government had already taken pains to abolish." He is obviously referring to the message sent to certain French Catholics, at the time of the General Election, exhorting them not to divide the anti-Bloc vote by setting up candidates of their own; and to the correspondence with the Bishops relative to the filling up of vacant sees. Perhaps it is natural that a Protestant should see in this an attempted continuance of diplomatic functions; but the Cardinal Secretary in his letter of protest has called attention to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Holy See which is essential to the constitution of the

Catholic Church ; and it was in virtue of this, not of any diplomatic pretensions, that the acts were done which "Diplomaticus" condemns. Such acts the Holy See will never consent to forego, nor will the faithful, whether clergy or laity, ever abstain from soliciting them and obeying them. Of course the Government may declare even this class of acts to be contrary to their law, and this is what Maitre Mornet, the *avocat* for the Republic, sought to do in the Jouin trial. But to take up this attitude is to acknowledge openly that their law is persecution pure and simple of the Catholic religion, and is to eat their own repeated professions of tolerance ; especially those of M. Briand, who several times over, during the discussions of December and January, laid stress on the perfect liberty of such relations with the Vatican which the Separation Law allowed.

The special pretext which the French Government alleged for its action was based on supposed judicial grounds. They claimed knowledge that Mgr. Montagnini had incited the three *curés* to disobey the Separation Law, and so had the right to search his premises for the incriminating documents. But no case could possibly have broken down more utterly, or even more ludicrously. For, as has been pointed out by several French lawyers, for instance, by Maitre Jules Challamel, in the *Journal des Débats* for March 12th, (1) Mgr. Montagnini should in that case have been not expelled, but retained in the country till the courts had either convicted or discharged him of the imputed offence. (2) Both he and the three *curés* should have been present, either in person or by their representatives, at the perquisition to see that all was done fairly ; and only such papers should have been taken as bore on the incrimination in question, the rest being returned to the owner ; in other words, at most, out of all the thousand and more letters, the six or eight which were subsequently used at the trial should alone have been retained. As it was, the police, and a Foreign Office official, were the only parties present at the search, and these did what they chose with the papers, and then delivered them over indiscriminately to translators who had not even been sworn, as the practice of the Courts required. It is the French version of these translators, manipulated for aught we know by garblings, interpolations, and omissions—indeed probably thus manipulated, for how else explain the many *démentis* which the publication provoked—it is this suspicious version which was used in court, and which has been circulated far and wide by

the press, the letters having apparently been sold in batches to the newspapers that sought them, by these translators or some other Government officials.

Moreover, when at last, after four months inexplicable delay the case came into court, the proceedings were so grotesque as to savour more of a comic operetta than of a grave court of justice. Only one Abbé out of the three was indicted, the other two being recognized as unaffected by the charge. (3) The sole charge against this one was that in one of the weekly leaflets he distributes at the church door, he had used the words, "Our sorrow, sad and deep as it is, must be an armed sorrow. It is no longer sufficient to keep the Faith, we must also defend it;" words which, as the Abbé contended and the court itself allowed, were used metaphorically, of the armour of the soul, not of the body. (4) On the Abbé asking to be told which of the Montagnini papers were held to incriminate him, the *avocat* for the Republic replied "there are none against you;" and the President of the Court said these papers "had no importance as regarded the case" before him. (5) It would have seemed to follow that the motive alleged for the confiscation of the papers had broken down, and that in this particular trial at all events no use should be made of them. But the Government must try to save its face, and so its *avocat* concocted the pretext that the papers were admissible as evidence, as tending to extenuate the guilt of the accused, who would not have committed his offence had it not been for Mgr. Montagnini's orders; and having constructed for himself this basis, M^e Mornet spent five minutes on the Abbé Jouin, and two hours on Mgr. Montagnini and the Pope. The Abbé Jouin protested that he had received no orders from Mgr. Montagnini, who, moreover, had no power to give them; that the only authorities from whom he had ever received orders were his Bishop, and beyond the Bishop the Pope, that consequently his connection with the case had ceased to exist, and it should be called rather the Clemenceau case, or the Montagnini case. (6) This was an obviously sound contention, but it meant that the Government was in the absurd position of prosecuting a man who had not only not been made to appear in court, but had even been prevented from appearing in court, to hear and reply to the charges against him. Nor was there a syllable in the letters that were read in court which convicted him of aught else than reporting on the condition of the country

and its religious needs to one who, by divine appointment, is chiefly responsible for the course to be taken by the French Church, as by every other Church, in a critical hour of its existence. Whether Mgr. Montagnini's reports were in all cases correct, or his observations wise, is beside the mark as far as the characterization of M. Clemenceau's dealing with his papers is concerned. But the Holy See can claim that, out of an ordeal to which only the most barefaced contempt for honour and justice could subject it, it has drawn a clear proof that it has acted throughout with the most perfect loyalty, dignity, and moderation—opposing, in short (to use Pius X.'s recent words), "love to hatred, truth to error, pardon to maledictions." (7) The Judgment in this strange case was in keeping with the *requisitoire*. Not a word has it to say about the Montagnini letters; and, whilst it pronounces the Abbé Jouin guilty of an offence against the Separation Law, which under the circumstances it considers sufficiently punished by a fine of sixteen francs, it does not hesitate to declare that the action punished ought never to have been made an offence, and had been so made in defiance of the most elementary considerations of equity.

Such is the issue of this wonderful *procès*, which is rendered yet more wonderful by the circumstances of the time of its occurrence.

Really too glaring [says the *Journal des Débats*, for April 13] is the contrast which is presented by the severity with which the Government dissects an ecclesiastical metaphor, at a time when it remains inactive in the face of the provocations to violence, to insurrection, to desertion, which are paraded on the walls of Paris under the protection of the Trades Unions. No question there of the meaning of ambiguous terms. Nothing could be clearer or more direct than the usual style of the Labour Confederation. And yet the *Parquet* does not move; the *juges d'instruction* open no inquiries; the police commissioners violate no Trades Union immunities, doubtless more sacred than diplomatic immunities. In the whole of this Abbé Jouin *procès*, it is this which most impresses the public. When the socialists menace the public peace a *curé* is prosecuted.

S. F. S.

The Pronunciation of Latin.

There can be little doubt that we are shortly to witness a more serious attempt than has yet been made, to bring the mode of Latin pronunciation current in England into harmony with that of other nations. The movement for reform has its origin in various quarters. Scientific men find more and more the need of an international tongue in which they shall all be equally at home and intelligible to one another; and the botanists in particular, since their congress at Vienna two or three years ago, feel this to be a pressing necessity, for at present an Englishman's Latin is as incomprehensible to a Continental scholar as if he spoke Chinese.

It appears, moreover, that our educational authorities are about to take the matter up, and to impose upon all under their jurisdiction a system of Latin pronunciation which they have determined to introduce, but whether this is likely to be a help or a hindrance to true reform, is another question.

The end which should be kept in view is obviously, before all else, the practical one of rendering Latin once more, as it used to be centuries ago, an international tongue for scholars of all races, or rather of admitting English scholars to share the advantages of such a tongue which are already enjoyed by those of France, Germany, Italy, and Spain. Each of these—the French especially—have their own peculiarities of pronunciation, distinguishing them from one another, but these do not avail, as do the sounds which Englishmen are accustomed to give the vowels, to make the Latinity of one of these peoples incomprehensible to the others.

It would therefore seem that common-sense would suggest the adoption of some system which shall sufficiently resemble those in use on the Continent to secure this practical object; but unfortunately the Oxford and Cambridge Professors, to whom the framing of a scheme was committed, complicated the matter by the introduction of a pedantic element which threatens to destroy the practical benefit of the change, and, more unfortunately still, their recommendations have been adopted by the Education Office.

It is accordingly proposed to endeavour to recapture the "Augustan" pronunciation, and to make Englishmen pronounce Latin in the manner in which the contemporaries

of Virgil and Horace may be supposed to have pronounced it. Even were this possible—which is a point much disputed—it is clear that the result must be to isolate the English pronunciation from that of other countries little less effectually than at present. If Frenchmen, Germans, and Spaniards understand one another, it is not because their several pronunciations resemble the ancient but the *modern* Roman, which is the fundamental type upon which all are based, and if we are to call *Cicero* "Kikero"—*vicissim* "we kiss him," and *jacio* "yakio," our mode of speech will be to them little less puzzling than it is now when we pronounce *mihi* as "my high," or *Ante mare* as "Aunty Mary." The diphthongs, too, are to be violently dealt with, and such a word as *aquae* is to be written *aquai* and pronounced "aquah-ee."

Another disturbing element is the proposal to mark quantity in speaking, calling *pater*, for instance, "patter," and *sumus* "summus." No doubt it would be desirable thus to distinguish long and short vowels, if, in the first place, we know how this ought to be done in accordance with classical usage, and, in the second, if the attempt were not calculated to neutralize practical advantages which are more important. To speak of "patter," instead of "pater," is not in reality to shorten the "a," but to attribute to it a different sound, and it is not easy to suppose that this was the old Roman practice. It is remarkable that in order phonetically to represent such an abbreviation, we have to double the consonant following, which to a Roman would have meant not the shortening, but the lengthening of the preceding vowel.

It seems, therefore, as has been well observed by a writer in the *Church Times*, that were the attempt to introduce this so-called Augustan pronunciation fully successful, it would make our Latin no more comprehensible to foreign scholars, than the French taught in Chaucer's time at Stratford-atte-Bowe would be to the present inhabitants of Provence.

For English Catholics the question has a special interest, since it is undoubtedly most desirable that in regard of Latin they should understand and be understood by their fellow-countrymen, which is not the case at present. They are quite at home with Continental scholars, but their Latin is quite unintelligible to an English University or public-school man, and his no less to them. The traditional English mode of pronouncing Latin is not impossibly that which obtained in

England previous to the Reformation, when Latin was undoubtedly the common language of the learned throughout Christendom, in which Englishmen appear to have found no difficulty in communicating with their brethren abroad. There are even those who maintain that the present prevailing English system was deliberately introduced in order to make Continental Latin, and especially the Catholic Liturgy, unintelligible to the people.¹ The fact that north of the Tweed a pronunciation almost identical with the English has always prevailed goes far to justify the belief in its antiquity.

But although their traditional pronunciation has thus strong claims upon Catholics, they must undoubtedly be prepared, like others, to sacrifice something for the sake of securing the practical advantages of national uniformity. In their case, however, the sacrifices required will be slight as compared with others. Indeed, except for the abandonment of the awkward sound by which they are accustomed to represent the vowel "u" in certain positions, *Per Dominum nostrum . . . Filium tuum*, for example, there would be little to alter on any sane principle of modification.

But if the "Augustan" pronunciation is to be foisted upon us, and bolstered up by such artificial means as officialdom can command, nothing but confusion worse confounded can be expected.

One sign of hope may be noted. The men of science, who, as has been said, are anxious for a reform, evidently take a far more rational view of what is desirable and practicable, and advocate a system of pronunciation on far simpler and more sensible lines than those we have been considering.² These savants at least are not under the control of the Education Office, and it is to be hoped that they will not submit to be forced into an absurd and impracticable position by its whims.

J. G.

¹ See L. C. Miall's *Thirty Years of Teaching*, p. 136. "Roger Ascham [he writes] and Sir John Cheke must needs break with the Latin of the monks, and it was they who set up that insular pronunciation which we are ashamed to produce before foreigners." See also the speech of Dr. Gow, Headmaster of Westminster, at the Headmasters' Conference of 1906 (*The Times*, December 22, 1906).

² See for example the *Glossary of Botanic Terms*, by Mr. B. Daydon Jackson, General Secretary of the Linnean Society, Appendix B. p. 366.

Reviews.

I.—SPINOZA.¹

HIS *Ethics*, though circumstances prevented him from publishing it during his lifetime, was regarded by Spinoza as his most important work. It is, however, far from easy to understand, and Mr. Allanson Picton offers us a study of its argument. He was moved, he tells us, to write it, by "the growing impression that a rich vein of common-sense and sound morality runs through all his speculations, though it has often to be digged for as a hidden treasure." Of much that is to be found in Spinoza's *Ethics* it may readily be admitted that this is a true account. There are, for instance, many acute observations in the Definitions of the Mental Affections and in the Right Principle of Living, which form the contents of his Appendices to Parts III. and IV.; and it is with the sections where Mr. Picton cites largely from these Appendices, that his readers will be chiefly interested. At the same time even here, before drawing an inference as to Spinoza's originality, it might be well to compare St. Thomas of Aquinas's *Secunda Secundae*, and even the still older Aristotle's *Ethics*. But in any case the speciality of Spinoza's theory is to be sought not in his observations of this sort, but in the fundamental conceptions on which he builds, and judged from this standpoint there are flaws in his *Ethics* which Mr. Picton has not perceived. The difficulty for Spinoza, as for all others who have trod in his footsteps, is to find a sufficient basis for morality apart from acknowledgment of the existence of a personal God, and of the freedom of the Will. He lays down, as a first principle, that right conduct is acting according to the dictates of right reason, and there we shall all agree with him, as we shall also—though not in several important particulars—when he contends that by the application of this principle we can deduce the code of moral precepts by which our conduct should be ruled. But we all of us

¹ *Spinoza. A Handbook to the Ethics.* By J. Allanson Picton. London: Constable.

distinguish sharply between compliance with these precepts when it is freely rendered, and when it is the outcome of some necessary process; in the former case deeming the act to be praiseworthy and moral, in the other not. For instance, we deem it praiseworthy in the servant who calls us so punctually in the morning, but not in the alarm which arouses us with equal punctuality, or even in the cock which is so punctual in its crowing. Spinoza seeks to meet this difficulty not indeed by denying that we have freedom, but by applying the name to a process to which it does not belong. As Mr. Picton puts it,

The freedom expounded [by Spinoza] is not that of caprice or self-will, but simply action without compulsion or restraint from without. And by compulsion or restraint from without is meant any impelling or deterring influence which is not spontaneously generated within the area of the man's nature considered as a finite expression of God. Thus no man is free who acts through hope of Heaven or fear of Hell, or through the impulsion or restraint exercised by any other pleasure desired or penalty feared.

And he gives, quite correctly, as illustrations of Spinoza's idea of freedom, the poet's *afflatus*, "I do but sing because I must," and the sport of lambs on a spring evening. Yet to say this is to go straight against our most elementary idea of freedom. For no one, surely, thinks that the sporting lambs are free, and the very idea of the poet expressed by his "must," is that he cannot help singing, in other words, that his singing proceeds not from this freedom of action he has in other respects, but from a certain inward compulsion. Nor does any one in setting the hope of a prize or the fear of the rod before a schoolboy imagine that he is thereby destroying his freedom of action.

Nor, again, do either Spinoza or his commentator explain to us successfully whence we get the idea of obligation, supposing the belief in a God, a non-Pantheistic God, to be without warrant in reason. It is significant that neither in Mr. Picton's *Index*, nor, in his book, so far as we have been able to discover, is there any reference to the term "obligation." The nearest allusion to it we can find is, under the name of *sanction*, in a passage where, speaking of the "usual sanctions of morality, God, eternity—in the true sense—reward and punishment, repentance, &c.," he says, Spinoza "gives them a profounder security by showing that they are no mere ordinations of any will, but the eternally necessary results of that divine nature which in its infinity is

absolutely perfect and good." But this does not help us very much to overcome the difficulty that if a man says, "I do not choose to follow right reason" there is, on Spinoza's system, nothing to compel him, or anything which, in a vast number of cases, can convince him that he will not be the gainer in the end by his wrong-doing.

A commentator must follow his author, and may still be doing his work very well, though unable successfully to vindicate his author in all respects. Thus considered, Mr. Allanson Picton has produced a book which can be read with interest by the philosophically-minded, even though one cannot but feel that he sometimes misses the point of Spinoza's arguments through unfamiliarity with the Scholasticism which, though he discards some of its conclusions, was still the mould in which Spinoza had learnt to think.

2.—THE RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN FRANCE.¹

The English Press continues to insist that the French Catholics have brought their present troubles on themselves by their political plottings, and that the Government has been actuated throughout by no anti-Christian spirit, but only by the desire to protect the national security with as little restriction of religious liberty as possible. And there are, unfortunately, too many Englishmen whose anti-Catholic prejudices make them willing victims to these newspaper misrepresentations. On the other hand, there is no inconspicuous number of our fellow-countrymen who, as daily intercourse proves, are most anxious to learn the real truth about the question, and welcome any trustworthy information that can be furnished. Fortunately, a good deal of such information is gradually reaching them, such as, for instance, can be got from the Comtesse de Franqueville's letter to the *Times*, and article in the new number of the *Church Quarterly Review*. The book before us is of a more homely kind, but is well worthy of being perused. It consists of letters written during the last six years' residence in France, which have already appeared in the Press of the United States. They are not like too many newspaper correspondences, but are moderate in tone, and bear the mark of having been written

¹ *The Religious Persecution in France (1900—1906).* By J. Napier Brodhead; London : Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co.

with a due sense of responsibility by one who was in close touch with the facts all through, and could discern the true inwardness as well as the external character of the events which have succeeded one another so quickly in the last few years. It helps, too, to understand the movement, to watch how the writer's first impressions of March, 1900, grow into clear convictions by November, 1906, the date of the last of these letters—for the two concluding sections are not letters recording present events, but essays, and instructive essays, on Liberty and Christianity, and on Christianity and Civilization. Thus, also, the reader has the means of considering as a whole this painful history which, though it was unfolded in distinct stages, beginning with the Associations Bill and terminating (so far) with the Separation Act, has been stamped by a unity of purpose throughout, and a unity of purpose devised and elaborated as regards the relative order and manner of its two stages by the Grand Orient of France. Very significant in this connection is the Manifesto which was published by this all-powerful body on November 3, 1904, and one could wish that Mr. Brodhead had given its text in full, instead of only portions of it. "Without Freemasonry," boldly says this document, "the Republic would not exist;" and, referring to the elaborate spy system in the army, the discovery of which astonished the country and caused the overthrow of the Combes Ministry, it defends it on the ground that "the head partner, or *commanditaire* of a great industrial enterprize in which he has placed his capital, has the right to denounce to the manager the peculations of his employes;" the head partner being obviously the Grand Orient, from whose archives the *affiches* were stolen by a recreant Mason, B. Bidegain, and given to the public. Of this B. Bidegain, it says:

He projected to steal from our archives documents confided to us. . . . We signal him to Masons all over the world. In exacting the just punishment of his crime, the Council of the Order summons him before masonic justice, and, until the final sentence is rendered, we suspend all his titles and prerogatives. . . . And now we declare to the whole Freemason body that in furnishing these documents (*i.e.*, these spy denunciations) the Grand Orient has accomplished only a strict duty. We have dearly conquered the Republic, and claim the honour of having procured its triumph. . . . Without the Freemasons the Republic would not be in existence. . . . Pius X. would be reigning in France.

Another point upon which these letters give interesting facts. Even had it been true that some of the French clergy were plotting against the Republic, no such charge could lie against the poor nuns who in such numbers were quietly praying, teaching, and engaging in works of charity in their various convents. Why expel them and reduce them to starvation? But it was said, "Oh, we shall provide for their maintenance." An instance of how they are doing this is furnished by Mr. Brodhead from a letter of the Bishop of Nancy to M. Briand.¹ From a convent at Nancy, fifty-six nuns were turned out in 1902, their convent being sold for 527,000 francs. Within the four years, twelve of them had died, and the remainder had received 12,000 francs to be divided among them. Another incident useful to know and bearing on the kindred question of the character of the schools to make way for which the Congregational schools were destroyed, is taken by the author from the *Dépêche Dauphinoise*, an anti-clerical paper, which appears to have approved highly of the affair. A child of twelve, a pupil of the *École laïque* at Allevard, died last autumn. A young companion was deputed to give an address at her grave, and this is how it ran: "For thee infinite nothingness has begun, as it will begin for all of us. Thy death, or rather the supposed Being who caused it, must be very wicked or very stupid. . . . He made thee the victim of a society refractory to society solidarity. . . . We really cannot excuse this celestial iniquity."

A complaint we have against the author is that he has too much the French newspaper habit of giving insufficient references. It would have been easy, for instance, in the case of the quotation just given to supply the date of this number of the *Dépêche Dauphinoise*.

3.—HISTORY OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS IN NORTH AMERICA.²

It is seldom that the reviewer has to report on an English Catholic work of a magnitude and thoroughness like that of Father Thomas Hughes. To be sure the work treats primarily of that land of great things, America. But though the geography is mostly American, the history is almost entirely

¹ Nov. 17th, 1906.

² *History of the Society of Jesus in North America.* By Thomas Hughes, S.J. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 647 pp. Royal Octavo. 15s.

English. It describes the English immigration, and is a record of English ideas, enterprize, courage, character, diversified, let us add, by English foibles, party squabbles, and grumbles. There is a full description of the works and archives consulted, especially the Jesuit archives, and the value of these chapters is considerable. The period covered begins with the departure of missionaries in 1633 and ends with the Civil War in 1645. It is the period of the predominance of Lord Baltimore's family, of which we hear much. Father Hughes presents to us Cecil, the second lord, in a somewhat less favourable light than that which has hitherto been usual. But here, as usual, he produces such a wealth of evidence in support of his views that we do not venture to question his conclusions.

The Jesuit Father most in evidence is Father Andrew White, an attractive and admirable figure, and there are a handful of followers, men evidently worthy of their chief. The story tells us of their gradual success amid a thousand difficulties, external and domestic (Father Hughes is commendably full and conscientious in telling us the real truth upon unwelcome, as well as about welcome truths), in building up a mission, that endures and flourishes even at the present day, though the volume closes with the apparently crushing catastrophe of the Civil War.

English students will not always agree with Father Hughes's presentation of men and things. True, he has many very difficult matters to treat of, controversies both with Protestants and Catholics, and the perennial "Jesuit question." He always has facts worth recounting, papers worth quoting, though we should here and there accentuate other circumstances, draw different conclusions, and use other terms. Sometimes, though not often, one comes upon phrases and sentences, which hardly seem worthy of so scholarly a work. The writer is full of enthusiasm for the different matters that come up for discussion, and the interest he takes cannot but communicate itself to his readers, though his historic narrative is not of a very high order, the numerous details impede the presentation of the history as a whole. On the other hand, ample indices, tables, and maps enable one to find one's way without difficulty about a book which bristles with information, and introduces us in every section to new lands, to little-known persons, to rare books, important legislation, or deep social, philosophic, and religious questions. Not the least commendable feature in this admirable volume is the very reasonable price at which it has been produced.

4.—TYBURN CONFERENCES.¹

Dom Bede Camm's well-known familiarity with the records of our English martyrs will always win him a ready hearing. His presentation of their stories is, moreover, enhanced by his familiar acquaintance with the actual scenes amid which their heroic struggles took place. These ever-ready place allusions give a tone of striking reality to the narrative. Now it is to this hall in Lancashire, now to that church in Derbyshire, or to the cliffs at Whitby, to a ferry across the Thames, or to the bridge on Higham Ferrers, and so forth. One cannot help feeling at every turn that it is our own country, our own kith and kin, which are in question. Add to this that the Conferences are written with unusual grace of style, and are stored with apt quotations, ancient and modern, grave and gay, in poetry and in prose, and we hope that we have said enough to induce our readers to read for themselves. They will not be disappointed.

5.—MAKERS OF MODERN MEDICINE.²

In the present work, Dr. Walsh, whose excellent book, *Catholic Churchmen in Science*, was noticed in our issue for November last, gives an instructive and interesting sketch of various pioneers of medical progress who by their discoveries have in various directions notably extended the frontiers of the healing art. He does not write, it must be noted, for specialists only, but has provided for all who desire information on the subject a very readable account of those whom he has selected for this purpose. Starting with Morgagni, who was styled by no less an authority than Professor Virchow the "Father of Pathology," we are introduced severally to such great names as Jenner, Galvani, Müller, Schwann, and Pasteur, to mention but a few, and are presented in each case with a careful and lucid sketch, not only of the man himself and his career, but of the character and significance of his contributions to knowledge.

A main object of the author is avowedly to examine the assumption that the study of medicine tends to make men irreligious,—as it has been said, "Show me three physicians and

¹ *Tyburn Conferences*: Oxford, Douay, Tyburn. By Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B. London: Burns and Oates. 1906.

² *Makers of Modern Medicine*. By James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph. D., LL.D. New York: Fordham University Press. Pp. 362. Two dollars. 1907.

I will find you two atheists." As against this, Dr. Walsh shows that of the illustrious band with whom he deals, and who in original research and thought hold a conspicuous place among their fellows, not one was an atheist or materialist,—but all on the contrary were sincerely religious, and a large proportion of them were devout Catholics.

By such publications as these Dr. Walsh is undoubtedly rendering most opportune and valuable service in assisting those who, from insufficient knowledge of facts, are liable to be swept away by the flood of shallow rationalism with which we are deluged, and the confident assertions which with so many of our "popular scientists" take the place of argument.

6.—THE LIFE OF SIR TOBIE MATTHEW.¹

Mr. Mathew has presented us with an interesting biography of a remarkable man. Sir Tobie's father was an Anglican Bishop, who persecuted Catholics to death, yet the son became a Catholic. Thrice banished from England, he won his knighthood and reached a position of influence in a Court which hated Catholics, yet died in exile. He was employed on missions to Spain, France, and Ireland, he lived in Italy, Ireland, Rome, and in Flanders. Having been secretly ordained priest, he took some part in the burning clerical controversies of those days, and is believed by his biographer to have been a Jesuit. He is mentioned in many memoirs and contemporary letters, and his friend Bacon called him his *Alter ego*.

Such a life offers large scope to the biographer, and Mr. Mathew has succeeded, if not to perfection, yet very respectably, and he has written a book which every one can read and enjoy.

A side-issue claims a passing word. Was Sir Tobie a Jesuit? Mr. Mathew decides in the affirmative for reasons which are not convincing. A nun wrote "an exact relation of her whole life," and did so "by command," while in it she addresses "Dear Mr. Mathew." On this our author argues that such a command could *only* have emanated from her Jesuit confessor, and that Mathews *must* have been that Jesuit!

The fact seems to have been that the knight was very devout to the Society, and participated in all its privileges

¹ *The Life of Sir Tobie Mathew.* By Arnold H. Mathew. pp. 391. 12s. 1907.

and his intimate connection with it is sometimes spoken of in generous terms, which it is certainly hard to gauge accurately. Yet he neither lived in Jesuit houses, nor under Jesuit discipline. When buried (in a Catholic country), no Jesuit epitaph was put on his grave. He retained the use of money, &c., in a way inconsistent with Jesuit Rules. Even though he should have formulated his private devotion to the Order by vow, that would not have altered his status. No official notice of his reception among the Jesuits has yet been discovered, and no writers, who have had access to official papers, have reckoned him as of the Society. The case for considering him a Jesuit is not made out.

Short Notices.

THE Cambridge University Press have recently issued the third and concluding volume of the Poems of George Crabbe, edited by the Master of Peterhouse. Together with the monumental study of the poet by M. René Huchon, this will, it is to be hoped, induce many readers who may not already have done so to acquaint themselves with the works of a writer of such marked originality and power, who has been well described as "Pope in worsted stockings," and for whom, as he himself tells us, Cardinal Newman always entertained much esteem and admiration.

From the same press comes the second volume of Abraham Cowley's English writings—containing the poems not included in the folio which appeared in the year following his death (those included therein appeared in the first volume of this edition) along with the prose contents of this folio, and Cowley's English Plays.

The story of St. Margaret of Cortona, told by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., in *A Tuscan Penitent* (London : Burns and Oates, 1907, pp. iv. 291. 4s. 6d. net), is a very extraordinary and exceptional one in the annals of sanctity. Beginning life not only as a thoroughly worldly girl, but entangled for nine years in an illicit *liaison*, she not only, after her lover's death, became a Religious of the Third Order of St. Francis, but a mystic of mystics, in continual receipt of wonderful supernatural visitations and favours. These are fully related in the "Legend" composed by Fra Giunta Bevegnati, her confessor, which is adapted and translated by Father Cuthbert, who prefixes a short Life.

Stories of the Great Feasts of Our Lord. By the Rev. James Butler (London: Sands and Co., 1907, pp. 94 2s. 6d. net) is a narrative in simple language for boys and girls of some of the earlier and later mysteries of the Life of Christ. Father Butler freely paraphrases the text of Scripture, in order to be more intelligible to the young, nor does he confine himself to the matter furnished by the Evangelists, but—as in the story of the Epiphany and elsewhere—makes use of that supplied by legend.

The eight illustrations which accompany the text are from pictures by masters of very various schools, from Fra Angelico, Luini, and Ghirlandajo, to Guffin and Scheffer.

Father Vincent McNabb, O.P., is right in thinking that the Decrees of the Vatican Council should be better known. Even those unprepared to accept them as authoritative will at least find in them a clear and forcible statement of fundamental Catholic doctrines, such as, if interested in knowing the truth about the Catholic Church, they should be glad to have in their hands. They may welcome this text of the *Decrees of the Vatican Council* which Father McNabb has edited, and Messrs. Burns and Oates have published in a tasty and convenient form.

Moehler, par Georges Goyau (Librairie Bloud), is a volume of the series entitled, *La Pensée Chrétienne, Textes et Études*. Both names, that of the author and that of his subject, are such as to attract one to this little study. The controversies on Justification are not so burning now as they were, in England, forty or fifty years ago, but those who at that distant date were led to read Moehler's *Symbolik* found in it almost a revelation, with such philosophic insight and such lucid exposition does it set forth the root ideas of the contending systems, Luther's and the Council of Trent's, and trace the course of their development in the Protestant sects and the Catholic Church. In M. Goyau's book the present generation has the advantage, with less expenditure of time, of grasping the essentials of Moehler's thought, on Justification, the Sacraments, and the Unity of the Church, and also of studying it in its living connection with his life.

In *L'Evangile selon Saint Jean* (*Études bibliques*, Paris: Librairie Lecoffre), Père Th. Calmes, SS.CC. furnishes, together with an Introduction, the text of St. John's Gospel with some very brief notes. But, though brief, they are those of a careful scholar, and will form a safe and useful guide to readers of this difficult Gospel.

Religious Instruction in Schools, by Robert J. Smythe. *The Pope and the French Government—Who's to Blame*, and *M. Briand's Real Sentiments* (the last two contained under one cover), are republications by the C.T.S. of articles that have appeared in our columns.

Magazines.

Some contents of foreign Periodicals:

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KATHOLISCHE THEOLOGIE. (1907, II.)

The forgiveness of sins in Origen. *J. Stufer*. The early Church and the truth of the Biblical narrative. *E. Dorsch*. Leo X. and the German Indulgence for St. Peter's in 1514. *H. Schrörs*. Reviews, &c.

REVUE DES QUESTIONS HISTORIQUES. (1907, II.)

The Baptismal Question in the time of St. Cyprian. *A. d'Alès*. Leopold I. and his Court (1681—1684). *G. Guillot*. The Persecution of Religious in the eighteenth century. *H. du Bourg*. The Campaign against the "Emigrés." *P. Bliard*. Current English Literature. *Abbot Cabrol*. Reviews, &c.

REVUE D'HISTOIRE ECCLESIASTIQUE. (1907, II.)

The Introduction of St. Chrysostom into the Latin world. *C. Baur*. The Holy See and its attitude to the Immaculate Conception in early days. *P. Doncoeur*. The Franciscan Question. *A. Fierens*. Negotiations between England and the Low Countries in the seventeenth century. *L. Willaert*. Reviews, &c.

REVUE BÉNÉDICTINE. (1907, II.)

The *Ad Constantium* of St. Hilary of Poitiers. *A. Wilmart*. The *Te Deum* as a type of Anaphora. *G. Morin*. The Fall and Indictment of the Carafas. *R. Ancel*. A complete Manuscript of the fourth Book of Esdras. *D. De Bruyne*. Reviews, &c.

STIMMEN AUS MARIA LAACH. (April 22.)

The Riddle of the World and Materialism. *H. Hoffmann*. The Social Democratic Family of the Future. *V. Cathrein*. The Golden Madonna of Essen. *S. Beissel*. Rosmini and Rosminianism. *J. Bessmer*. Reviews, &c.

